

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XXII.

JANUARY, 1918.

No. 1.

LUTHERANISM AND PURITANISM.¹⁾

Four hundred years have elapsed since Dr. Martin Luther nailed his Ninety-five Theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg. Through this chosen vessel of His the Lord brought about the reformation of His Church. We heartily thank Him, especially during this year of jubilee, for the deliverance He has thus granted us from the slavery of the Bishop of Rome. This is the great theme of innumerable sermons preached, of countless discussions carried on, and of numberless books and pamphlets written within the folds of the Protestant Church during these months of rejoicing. But we Lutherans are just as grateful to our God for having kept us in the faith again restored to His flock by the great Reformer, and for having guarded us against the deceit of the many false prophets that have gone out into the world since the days of Luther.

Among the many pernicious sects which sprang up in the countries blessed of God through the Reformation, the Puritan is one of the most conspicuous. A comparison of Lutheranism with Puritanism would therefore not be out of place nor without value to us at this time.

"Puritans" was the name given to such in England as were opposed to the Established Church of that country during

1) This article and the next one were prepared for a new edition of the commemorative volume of essays on the Reformation, *Four Hundred Years*. Since the new edition will not be forthcoming soon, we publish them here.

the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Because they did not conform to the accepted "Thirty-nine Articles of Religion," they were called Nonconformists and Dissenters. Some believed in the presbyterial system of church government over against the ecclesiastical government of bishops of pretended apostolic succession with certain prerogatives. These went by the name of Presbyterians. Still others would have neither bishops nor presbyters as a ruling power in the Church, but taught that each congregation was independent and self-governing. They were called Congregationalists, or Independents. A number of these Independents, following a certain leader by the name of Robert Browne, are known as Brownists. Being most severely oppressed and persecuted, especially during the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, many of these Independents fled to Holland. Later on a part of them returned to England. In spite of all afflictions heaped upon them, these Independents multiplied and grew to such an extent that from 1640 to 1660, under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell, they had the affairs of the government in their hands. Some of those who fled to Holland emigrated to America, in order to be able "to cultivate unmolested that form of Christianity to which they were attached." History records them as the Puritans, or Pilgrim Fathers. They landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620. A certain writer has this to say of them: "Nowhere did the spirit of Puritanism in its evil as well as in its good form more thoroughly express itself than in Massachusetts."

On the following pages I shall mention a few points of comparison, or rather some of the differences between Puritanism and Lutheranism.

What is the fountainhead of each of these confessions? How did Lutheranism and how did Puritanism come into being? What is the basic principle of the one and of the other? Lutheranism is wholly and solely taken from, and founded upon, the Bible. To Luther the Bible was the Word of God, every syllable of it inspired by the Holy Ghost. His conviction was that this divine book alone could frame articles

of faith. He held that everything taught in this sacred volume must be accepted by the Christians as truth coming from God, and that everything adding to, or opposing, the teachings of the prophets and apostles must be rejected. One word of the Old or the New Testament made the world too narrow for him. That is why he met the shameless sale of indulgences carried on by John Tetzel with "Since Christ, our Lord and Master, says," etc. Therefore he declared before Emperor and Pope, "My conscience is bound in God's Word. Except I be convinced by passages of Holy Writ, I can and will not retract. Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise, God help me! Amen." For that reason he remained immovable in his debate with Zwingli concerning the real presence of the body and blood in the Lord's Supper, again and again remarking, "The text is too powerful." In short, come what might, everywhere, at all times, and under all circumstances, Luther stood squarely upon the Bible, raising his voice mightily against all that would not bow to every iota of the Law and the Testimony. And that is the stand which the Church justly bearing his name has always taken. Lutheranism is therefore Scripturalism.

Now, what of Puritanism? To the fathers of this school of theology Luther said most aptly, "You have a different spirit from ours." Zwingli and Calvin, who, as far as human agencies are concerned, are responsible for all the Reformed denominations, would not always follow the plain words of the holy men of God. And why not? The old Evil Foe having received a deadly blow when Luther was flying in the midst of the heavens preaching the everlasting Gospel, he cast about for some one to fill the chair which the Pope had occupied in his behalf in the Church, and again to dethrone the Word of the Lord, by which that Stronger, called Jesus Christ, comes upon and overthrows Satan in his palaces, the human hearts. Ah! and he that had such success in Paradise with his "Yea, hath God said ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" *i. e.*, "Is it reasonable that God should have said anything of the kind?"

again made use of his old trick to the destruction of many immortal souls. Through his treachery, preached by such men as Zwingli and Calvin, the Word of God was more or less supplanted by reason. "God does not ask us to believe anything we cannot comprehend," these words of Zwingli sound the keynote of the Reformed theology. Especially through the efforts of John Knox, a warm friend of Calvin, Calvinism took the place of Lutheranism in Scotland. Other Reformed theologians, during the reign of Edward VI, introduced the Reformed doctrines into England, where Lutheran doctrines had been taught and accepted. True, the Puritans separated themselves from the Anglican Church, but not on account of the Reformed principles. They rather accepted them. Reformed principles are at the bottom of all Puritan teachings. Puritans profess to be followers of the Bible, but are largely governed by their reason. So much for the springs from which Lutheranism and Puritanism issue.

Strict adherence to the Bible means fidelity to the Gospel, while following one's reason always leads into the Law. The center of the Bible is the Gospel, Christ and Him crucified. "To Him give all the prophets witness that through His name, whosoever believeth in Him, shall have forgiveness of sins." True, this book also contains the Law, not for the purpose of saving us by the keeping of its precepts, but in order to bring us to a knowledge of our sins and the need of a Savior. Having found forgiveness, life, and salvation in the grace of God in Christ Jesus, a child of the heavenly Father is admonished to walk in the way of the commandments, not for the purpose of meriting even the least part of his salvation, but to show his thankfulness toward God for what He has bestowed upon him, for having freed him through Christ, whose merits He offers in the Gospel, not only from the guilt and punishment, but also from the dominion of sin. A glorious, a cheerful Christianity, indeed, which springs from, and from beginning to end is brightened by, the glad tidings of the grace of God in Christ Jesus! Luther loudly proclaimed the perfectly lost

and condemned condition and the utter helplessness of natural man. He clearly set forth the justification of the sinner by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith. And, in spite of everything that may be said to the contrary, if ever man showed what good works are, and why we are to walk in newness of life, that man was Dr. Martin Luther, as may be seen, for instance, from his explanation of the commandments in his Catechisms, in which he sets forth so wonderfully what God would have us do and leave undone in His kingdom, always making it plain, however, that we are saved by faith, without the deeds of the Law. Indeed, he ever taught that Christians, because of the law in their members, which wars against the law of their minds, daily sin much and deserve nothing but punishment, and that the Holy Ghost must therefore richly and daily forgive all their sins. In his theology Christ was the beginning, middle, and end. And to this day the Lutheran Church, thank God, continues to teach these Scripture-doctrines. Lutheranism, therefore, is Gospelism.

But what is Puritanism? Reading their works, you will at times find Puritans speaking most beautifully of Christ and the redemption He has wrought for man. However, "buts" and "ifs" attached to such fine paragraphs destroy their comforting effect, and point man to the Law for his soul's salvation, not only the Law of God, but also certain rules and regulations of the Church, which must be observed to attain that end. In the tenets of all the Reformed denominations, but above all in those known as Puritan, we find "a large infusion of Judaism." They are very much "entangled with the yoke of bondage." Why did they separate from the Established Church of England? Not on account of the Reformed doctrines accepted by that body, but because of the vestments of the bishops and priests (which they called the bloody garments of Antichrist), the sign of the cross, the sponsors at Baptism, the forms of prayer, the pericopes, the kneeling at the Lord's Table, the bowing of the head when the name of Jesus was mentioned, the private baptism, the confirmation, the bells, organs, and

altars in churches, church festivals, and the like. Their confessions show that they do not correctly divide the Word of Truth, that they continually intermingle Law and Gospel, faith and works, justification and sanctification. Their religion is therefore a dreary religion, their doctrine a comfortless doctrine. For Puritanism is more or less legalism.

Lutherans and Puritans also differ greatly as regards their teaching concerning the efficacy and all-sufficiency of the Word and the Sacraments. These, and these alone, are the means through which God ordinarily deals with us. Paul writes: "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." 1 Cor. 1, 21. "My Word shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." This is the promise given by the Lord in Is. 55, 11. Again we are told: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Rom. 10, 17. The Gospel is therefore called "words of eternal life." John 6, 68. As for Baptism, the Apostle Paul declares it to be the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Titus 3, 5. And the Lord's Supper, being Gospel, is the power of God unto salvation. Rom. 1, 16. Believing this, Luther confesses: "The Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me with His gifts, sanctified and kept me in the true faith." Accepting the plain words of the Bible, he answers the question, "What does Baptism give or profit?" thus: "It works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives eternal salvation to all who believe this, as the words and promises of God declare." Following the Scriptures, he has this to say concerning the benefit of the eating and drinking of the Lord's Supper: "That is shown us by these words, 'Given and shed for you for the remission of sins'; namely, that in the Sacrament forgiveness of sin, life, and salvation are given us through these words." The Word and the Sacraments were to Luther the only means to extend, uphold, and defend the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Never would he have force to be used for the purpose of accomplishing any-

thing in God's kingdom of grace. The Word and the Sacraments, and they alone, should be used to draw souls to Christ. To bring home to sinful man the Word was, therefore, the aim of Luther. That was the trowel with which he would build, and the sword with which he would defend, the Church of God. He knew that it is the Christian's business to water and to plant, and God's prerogative to give the increase. Therefore he diligently preached the Word, wrote many books and pamphlets, composed many sacred hymns, translated the Bible, and urged the organization of Christian schools for the children—all for the purpose of bringing the souls bought with a price the Bread of Life and defending their inheritance against all enemies. And if any one having become a brother should trespass, and refuse to hear the church, he should be unto other Christians as "an heathen man and a publican." At no time, however, should these tares be gathered up by the Church, but they should be left to grow together with the wheat on the field of this world. In this connection it must be said that Luther was never in favor of turning over members that teach and live otherwise than the Word of God teaches to the civil authorities for punishment on account of their belief, as was frequently done by the Roman Catholics. He was entirely opposed to the union of Church and State. To him Christ's kingdom and the kingdoms of this world have nothing in common. The Church deals with man's relation to his God; and has the welfare of his immortal soul at heart. The State looks after the temporal well-being of its subjects, and must therefore be satisfied if these subjects bow to its authority, render to it tribute, custom, fear, and honor, and allow others about them, though they may not be of the same faith, to lead a quiet and peaceable life. It dare not, however, meddle with their religion, as long as that religion is not subversive of the work of the State. Following the Bible, Luther declared: The Church is governed by the Word of God and the State by reason. Fortunate are the conditions where the Church does not enter the province of the State, and the State does

not enter the domain of the Church. The separation of Church and State had its most faithful champion in Luther.

This is the stand which up to the present time is taken by all true Lutherans. The trowel and the sword with which they go forth to do the work of their Lord are the words of our divine Prophet, which are spirit, and which are life. John 6, 63.

But what do we find in Puritanism along these lines? To the fathers of the Puritans the Word of God was a dead letter. Zwingli, for instance, distinctly separates the preaching of the Word from the workings of the Holy Ghost. He says: "We see that with all nations the outward preaching of the apostles and evangelists, or bishops preceded faith, which we have the Holy Ghost alone to thank for." "I believe, yea, I know, that all Sacraments, instead of bestowing the grace, do not even bring and administer it." "The Spirit is not in need of a guide or a vehicle." This idea pervades the whole theology of the Reformed denominations. It is there the root of much evil and the only natural sequence of their religion of reason. In their work in the Church of God they were accordingly not satisfied with putting these means of grace into use, but introduced all kinds of regulations and disciplines, which they executed with great severity. They ever meddled with the affairs of the State, and used its arm to further their cause. Zwingli himself died in a battle in which he led his followers. And Calvin is known to have united, and thus commingled, Church and State in his sphere of action. Thus Christianity must lose its free and cheerful character, and groan under the burden of self-imposed laws. The Puritans, too, in fact, in many ways more than others of the followers of Zwingli and Calvin, were occupied and led by these false ideas concerning the Word and the Sacraments and the operation of the Holy Spirit. They, too, united Church and State wherever they could do so. They keenly felt the oppressions and persecutions of the Episcopal rulers in England, and complained against them. But no sooner were their own followers in power than

they, too, made use of carnal weapons of warfare. And if there is any difference between the two, it is to the disadvantage of the Puritans. The history of Cromwell and his time tells us of banishments and executions in the name of the newly established religion that are horrifying. And when those very people who had left their mother country on account of religious intolerance had set their foot upon this soil, they were for years extremely intolerant towards others, as the banishment of Roger Williams, John Cotton, John Wheelwright, Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, and others clearly show. And up to this day they would better the world by all kinds of rules, and regulations, and laws concerning Sunday, and drink, and the like, and in this way, to the great delight of the archenemy of mankind, spend many hours on inventions of their own instead of employing them to real advantage in the kingdom of the Savior by preaching and teaching the old, old story of the life, suffering, and death of the Son of God for the salvation of man. To try to better the world with laws, human or even divine, and to reform the nations by putting into operation these laws with severity, creates hypocrites, but never leads to God; in many cases such a procedure fills the heart of natural man with a deadly hatred against a religion so intolerant. We can rest assured, if the Puritans would have had their way when the Colonies united and formed this great Republic, we should never have enjoyed religious liberty in this country.

Considering the few points I have thus briefly touched upon, we find ample reason to be grateful to the Good Shepherd for having kept us in His Word and faith against the evil counsel and will of the world, the devil, and our flesh.

In conclusion I would say that one frequently hears the remark: The Lutheran Church stands closer to the Roman Catholic Church than the Reformed denominations, especially the Puritans. But this is a great mistake. On the contrary, the Lutheran Church is rightly and perfectly separated from the Roman Catholic Church, but not so the Reformed denominations. The Roman Catholic Church is founded upon the Pope;

the Reformed Church upon reason; the Lutheran Church upon the Bible. The Roman Catholic and the Reformed Churches rely more or less upon good works; the Lutheran Church believes, teaches, and confesses the justification of a lost and condemned sinner by grace for Christ's sake, through faith. This position alone has the promise: "If ye continue in My Word, then are ye My disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8, 31. 32.

Fort Wayne, Ind.

J. W. MILLER.

THE OFFICE OF THE KEYS.—ABSOLUTION.

THE OFFICE OF THE KEYS.

Rome to-day as stoutly as ever boasts of being the sole possessor of the power of the keys. She maintains as arrogantly as ever that the so-called "Holy Father" is the visible head of the Church, from whom, as Christ's vicar on earth, all power in the Church emanates. Again and again Rome declaims: Christ said to Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven"; Peter was thus made the head of the Church, the Pope is his successor, *ergo*, the Pope possesses the keys of heaven exclusively; the Roman Catholic Church is the only saving Church. *In ecclesia salus; extra ecclesiam nulla salus!* All other Churches are synagogs of Satan; with but few exceptions all non-Catholics are forever lost. Such are the exalted, but vain claims of Antichrist.

Again, *Absolution*, based on the Scriptural doctrine of the Office of the Keys, is anathematized by Rome, grossly misunderstood and severely criticized by non-Lutherans. Both doctrines, however, that of *absolution* as well as that of the Office of the Keys being a "peculiar Church-power," are founded on the impregnable Rock of Scriptures; both are noble heritages of the Reformation; both are distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church. Hence it behooves us in this, the four-hundredth anniversary of the glorious Reformation, to pass both in review, albeit briefly.

Now, what answer does our Church make over against the vaunting pretensions of Antichrist? To whom do the keys of the kingdom originally and immediately belong? Clear and unmistakable are the words of the *Smalcald Articles*: “But over and above all this we are to confess that the keys belong and have been given not to one man alone, but *to the whole Church*, as this can be clearly and satisfactorily proved. *For just as the promise of the Gospel belongs to the whole Church, originally and immediately, so also do the keys belong to the whole Church immediately; for the keys are nothing else than the office through which those promises are communicated to every one who desires them.* It is evident, then, that the Church, in effect, has the power to appoint her ministers. And Christ in these words: ‘Whatsoever ye shall bind,’ etc., clearly indicates *to whom* He has given the keys, namely, *to the whole Church*, when He says: ‘Wheresoever two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.’”

So our Church teaches that Christ gave the power of the keys *immediately and originally*—not to Peter exclusively, much less to the Pope,—not to the ministers of the Gospel, through whom this power would then *mediately* pass into the possession of the Church; but, on the contrary, *immediately* this power is given to the Church, the believers, through whom the ministers receive this high office.

In complete harmony with the declaration of the *Smalcald Articles*, Luther puts this deep doctrine into these simple words: “The Office of the Keys is the peculiar Church-power which Christ has *given to His Church* on earth to forgive the sins of penitent sinners unto them, but to retain the sins of the impenitent, as long as they do not repent.”

Now the question arises: What say the Scriptures? The seats of doctrine are: Matt. 16, 19; 18, 18; John 20, 23.

In Matt. 16, 19, the Lord, addressing Peter, says: “And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in

heaven." This is the Pope's stronghold. We do not intend to investigate his threadbare arguments. The Pope was never known to care for a text of Scripture, except as a pretext *ad majorem papae gloriam*. Be it said, however, that this very text, like a thunderbolt from heaven, demolishes all his preposterous pretensions. Briefly, what is the import of this passage?

Jesus had asked His *disciples*, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" The question was directed to *all* His disciples. "And *they* said, Some say Thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets." So there were various opinions afloat. "He saith unto them" (to His disciples), "But who say ye that I am?" What is your belief? "And Simon Peter answered and said," in the name of those addressed "*ye*," in the name of all *disciples*: "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" That was Peter's faith, that was the *disciples'* faith. This is plain from the words of Jesus, v. 20, where He charged His *disciples*, not Peter alone, "that *they* should tell no man that He was Jesus the Christ." Hence what follows applies to *all* His disciples, though naturally Christ addresses Peter, the spokesman: "*Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven.*" To know and to believe the mystery of mysteries which he confessed: the *Son of Man*, Mary's son, is at the same time "the Christ," the promised Messiah, "*the Son of the living God,*" is divine, not human knowledge. Peter had made a great *confession* in his own name and that of the disciples. The Lord shows him the origin of that faith, and then proceeds: "And I say also unto thee that *thou art Peter.*" Peter means rock-man; "Thou art Peter" = thou art a rock-man. You have based your faith upon rock—solid, safe, unshakable. This rock is expressed in your confession: "*The Son of Man is the Christ, the Son of the living God*"; and "*on this Rock,*" on *Myself*, "I will build My Church."

Now, what does it mean when Christ, continuing, says

to Peter: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven"? Beyond the shadow of a doubt this: You are *blessed* on account of *your faith*; you are a rock-man on account of *your faith*; on account of *your faith* I will give unto you the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Peter possesses the keys because he is a *believer*, and all who confess with Peter: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, are founded on the Rock, Christ, are His disciples, belong to the Church, possess the keys of the kingdom. Luther correctly declares: "We are all Peters if we believe like Peter." This is the only admissible meaning according to text and context, and Matt. 18, 18, the parallel passage, emphasizes this truth. Having spoken of excommunication by the *Church*, Christ adds: "Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever *ye* shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Not Peter alone, but all the disciples of Christ, "*ye*," the Church, and if there be but "two or three gathered together in His name," possess the power of the keys. "O that this passage were not in the Gospel!" Luther exclaims ironically. "What a fine thing that would be for the Pope! For here Christ gives the keys to the *whole Church* and not to St. Peter. And here belongs also the same saying, Matt. 16, 18, 19, where He gives the keys to Peter on behalf of the *whole Church*. For in this 18th chapter the Lord makes a gloss upon His own words, showing to whom He had previously (Matt. 16) given the keys in the person of St. Peter. They are given to *all Christians*, and not to the person, St. Peter." (*Buechlein von der Beichte*, Erl. 27, 363.)

Again, after His resurrection, Christ repeated, corroborated, this authority given to His disciples: "Whosoever sins *ye* remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins *ye* retain, they are retained." But before doing so, He says: "Peace be unto you; as My Father hath sent Me, so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them and saith, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." John 20, 23. Thus He manifested unmistakably that the keys of the kingdom are a gift to

such as have *received the Holy Ghost*, to true believers, to the Church. "The keys are not the Pope's (as he falsely claims)," says Luther, "but the Church's; that is, they belong to the people of Christ, the people of God, or the holy Christian people all the world over, or wherever there are Christians. . . . Just as Baptism, the Sacraments, God's Word, are not the Pope's, but belong to the people of Christ, so the keys are, and are called, *claves ecclesiae*, not *claves papae*." (*Schrift von Konzilien und Kirchen*, St. Louis Ed. XVI, 2279.)

Wherein does this peculiar Church-power consist? According to Matt. 16 in "to bind" and "to loose"; Matt. 18 speaks of "trespasses," "faults," that are to be bound or to be loosed, and John 20 says in plain words that this binding and loosing is "to remit sins" and "to retain sins." *Luther*: "Christ, our Lord, has said to His *disciples* and to the *whole Church*: I command you to forgive and to retain sin." (St. Louis Ed. XI, 763.)

Hence, Peter, extolling the high dignity of Christians, writes: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal *priesthood*, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvelous light." 1 Pet. 2, 9. "To show forth the praises of God," to preach the Gospel is the duty, the privilege, of all Christians. This is the Office of the Keys in the wider sense. From it flows the power to forgive and to retain sins. "There is no difference here, except that the same Word which in the preaching of the Gospel is usually everywhere publicly and generally proclaimed to every one is in private absolution declared privately to one or more who desire it." (*Luther*, St. Louis Ed. XI, 721.)

Since, then, all believing Christians have the power of the keys, who is to exercise this office *publicly*? All? Luther having been charged by Emser with teaching that the general priesthood made all to be preachers, he replied: "You lie when you say I have made all laymen bishops, priests, and ecclesiastics, so that they may at once, *uncalled*, assume the office; you

do not add, pious as you are, that I also wrote: *Only extreme necessity* can justify one in doing that to which he has not been regularly called." (Walch XVII, 1597.)

Chemnitz (*Examen Conc. Trid.*, cap. 85, p. 1687) relates that at his time the Jesuits ridiculed the Lutherans thus: "Then cobblers and tailors, cooks and day-laborers, have the power of the keys, and thus you build your own Babel and introduce endless confusions." He replied: "Who will deny that '*in case of need every believer may baptize,*' etc.? And this case of extreme necessity the Church has always made an exception, as Jerome testified against the Luciferians, and Augustine against Fortunatus. But, except in case of necessity, this is allowed to no one, unless he be a regularly called and appointed servant of the Church. For this would be to violate the divine rule: 'How can they preach except they be sent?' Rom. 10, 15. Again, 'They ran, and I did not send them.'" —

Who is to exercise the office *publicly*? Luther says, if every one would preach, who would constitute the hearers? If all would preach, there would be utter confusion and babble like that of frogs in a pond. — God is a God of order. In the Church there is a special office of the ministry. The incumbents called by the congregations are delegated to perform this Office of the Keys publicly. In Acts 20, 28 they are designated "overseers," and their duty is "to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." In 1 Cor. 4, 1 they are styled "stewards of the mysteries of God" and "ministers of Christ." In 2 Cor. 2, 5 Paul speaks of them as "your servants for Jesus' sake." So there is a "flock," and there are "overseers"; there are "servants" who preach, and people to whom they preach; there are "ministers of Christ," and such as they minister unto. The Bible and Luther teach that every congregation possesses the power of the keys, and that all believing Christians are priests and called to show forth the praises of God; but this priesthood does not involve the right of every Christian to preach and teach *publicly*. Hence the *Augsburg Confession* declares: "No one dare publicly teach or preach,

or administer the Sacraments, unless he be rightly called." (Art. XIV.)

Nor does this establish a superiority of the ministry over the laity. "One is your Master, even Christ; but ye are all brethren." *Luther*: "There is in reality no difference between the bishops, elders, and priests, and the laity, no one being distinguished from other Christians, *except that he has an office*, which is committed to him to preach the Word of God and to administer the Sacraments; just as a mayor or a judge is in no wise distinguished from other citizens, except that the government of the city is entrusted to him." (Walch XIX, 1340.)

The congregation of *believers*—not the Pope, not the bishops, not the ministry—originally and immediately possesses the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 16, 19; 18, 18; John 20, 23); the congregation of believers is originally and immediately commissioned to preach the Gospel to every creature and to administer the Sacraments; the congregation of believers is the body to whom all spiritual power originally and immediately belongs; the congregation of believers is entrusted with the power of appointing "overseers over the flock," "stewards of the mysteries of God," pastors, ministers, who in their name preach, baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, absolve; the congregation of believers constitutes a true spiritual democracy.

ABSOLUTION.

The power of the keys as involved in this whole discussion refers principally to the power to forgive sins, commonly called Absolution.

In perfect agreement with the doctrine briefly stated in the foregoing pages the Lutheran pastor, after a short confessional service, says to penitent sinners:—

"Upon this your confession, I, by virtue of my office, as a called and ordained servant of the Word, announce the grace of God unto all of you, and in the stead and by the command of my Lord Jesus Christ I forgive you all your sins, in the

name of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. Amen."

The minister says to penitent sinners: "I forgive you all your sins." Does he forgive sins by virtue of a peculiar power dwelling in him? No. He does it "by virtue of his office, as a called and ordained servant of the Word." The power is not in him, but in the *Word*. Does he forgive sin of his own authority? No, but "in the stead and by the command of my Lord Jesus Christ." Who is it, then, that forgives sin? The Lord Jesus Christ through His servant. Is there anything wrong about this? No; St. Paul did the very same thing. As a minister of Christ he forgave the sins of the man who on account of the sin of incest had been expelled from the Church at Corinth, but who had repented of his error. In reference hereto Paul writes: "If I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes *forgave I it in the person of Christ.*" 2 Cor. 2, 10.

The words of Jesus, spoken to His disciples, are plain as plain can be: "Then said Jesus unto them again, Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." John 20, 21—23. Again: "Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Matt. 18, 18.

But, still, notwithstanding Scripture is so clear regarding absolution, this ministerial absolution is a stumbling-block for many, and the doctrine, so full of comfort for terrified consciences, is viewed with suspicion even by some Lutherans.

All objections to this doctrine, however, find their cause in the ignorance of the Gospel of Christ, in the ignorance of the atonement of Christ, which the Gospel proclaims; in the ignorance of the means of grace, which impart the atonement to the sinner.

Absolution is firmly based on two indisputable facts:

1. God is perfectly reconciled through Christ to every sinner;
2. God has commanded this reconciliation to be preached to every sinner, to every penitent sinner, who longs for the sweet consolation of the Gospel.

When the truth of that wonderful Pauline passage, "The just shall live by faith," flashed upon Luther's mind, the cardinal principle of Christianity had been rediscovered. It was in defense of this doctrine—justification, forgiveness of sins, by faith alone, "the principal article of the Christian faith," "the only key to the whole Bible," "the article with which the Church stands and falls"—that Luther nailed the Ninety-five Theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg on that ever memorable October 31, 1517.

Forgiveness of sins! Three small words, and yet how much they imply!—"Sin is the transgression of the Law." 1 John 3, 4. *All men are sinners.* "There is no difference; *all have sinned*, and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3. And the result? "Your sins have *separated* between you and your God." Is. 59, 2. God pronounces a *curse* upon every sinner: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in *all* things which are written in the book of the Law to *do* them." Gal. 3. To be a sinner means to be a "child of wrath," Eph. 2, a damned person. Is there a way of escape? None that man can devise. What man, however, could not do God in His mercy has done. What did He do? Beautifully this is set forth in 2 Cor. 5, 19—21: "*God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray in Christ's stead, Be ye reconciled to God. For He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.*"

Here are the contents of the Gospel in small compass. The world was at enmity with God. A reconciliation must be effected. Man could not bring it about. God's love to the

world, lost in sin, prompted Him to do it. "God was *in Christ*, reconciling the world unto Himself." "God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the Law, to *redeem* them that were under the Law." Gal. 4. His purpose of coming into the world "to *save sinners*," 1 Tim. 1, 15, Christ achieved: "Christ *hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law*." Gal. 3. How? He "who knew no sin was made sin for us." "The Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all." Is. 53, 6. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." When Christ, expiring on the cross, more than 1900 years ago, cried out, "It is finished!" *God reconciled the world* unto Himself for Christ's sake. And in proof of the fact that this redemptive work was complete, God raised Christ from the dead. So God is reconciled with the whole world. No one need do or suffer anything to appease the wrath of God on account of the trespasses committed. In Christ, God now looks upon man as though he had never offended Him. In plain words this truth is expressed thus: "not imputing their trespasses unto them," *i. e., to the world*. In corroboration of this glorious fact St. John writes: "Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of *the whole world*." 1 John 2, 2.

To summarize the truths unfolded thus far: 1. God is *angry* at the sin of man; sin separates between Him and man. Is. 59, 2; Gal. 3. — 2. "When we were enemies, we were *reconciled* to God by the death of His Son." Rom. 5, 10.

The fact is accomplished — God is reconciled. But God's love prompted Him to do still more. In order that the sinner should know of this fact, — reconciliation completed, — aye, that the sinner should come into actual possession of it, God committed unto His ambassadors "*the word of reconciliation*." They are to cry out to a rebellious world, "God is reconciled! God beseeches you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, Be ye reconciled to God." Believe this *word*; accept the reconciliation, and the deed is done. This is the Gospel-message. "Preach the *Gospel* to every creature," says Christ in His last Great Commission. What does that say? 1. Bring the Gospel,

i. e., the glad tidings of the gracious forgiveness of sin, the glad tidings of pardon, to the world, and whosoever believes this Gospel is saved, his sins are forgiven.

But God's love even went beyond this. Knowing how slow of heart man is to believe, Christ not only commanded His disciples to publish these glad tidings in a general way, but He commissioned them to announce the reconciliation made by Him in particular to individuals. "Peace be unto you," Christ said after His resurrection to His disciples; "*as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you.*" And breathing on them, He said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." Christ's whole work of redemption had but one purpose in view: to bring peace, forgiveness of sin, reconciliation, to a sin-stricken world. To the multitudes He preached the Gospel of the kingdom; to individuals He said, "Peace be unto you." "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee." This power to forgive sins to penitent sinners Christ delegated to His disciples: "*As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.*" Thus Christ instituted the Office of the Keys, commonly called Absolution. What, then, is absolution? *It is the Gospel*, the glad tidings of the forgiveness of sins, peace with God, the reconciliation with God, *applied to individuals.*

True to their commission the apostles preached repentance and forgiveness of sins among all nations and forgave sins to individuals. The apostles possessed this power and exercised it—that is indisputable. The power was not granted to the apostles, however, in their capacity of *apostles*, but as *believers*, as disciples. It is a peculiar *Church*-power—the ambassadors of Christ acting in the name and by authority of the Church.

Now, what objections can be raised to absolution in view of the facts that God is reconciled with the world, and that God *commands* that this "word of reconciliation" be preached? What is there to prevent a Christian brother from saying to another, distressed on account of his sins: God is reconciled

with the *world* by His Son, you belong to the *world*, and therefore He is reconciled with *you*? What valid objection can be made to the called minister's saying to penitent sinners: Be assured, Christ is the Physician of the sick, the sin-sick; your sins are blotted out by His blood; "by His stripes ye were healed"?

Popery! A rag of popery! cry some.—These people know not whereof they speak. The Biblical doctrine of absolution has nothing in common with the blasphemous auricular confession of Rome. Why, it was against this very abuse of the Catholic Church that Luther was impelled to nail his famous Ninety-five Theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg.

Rome has limited the power of absolution to its priesthood. The priest is the *judge* of man's sins. At his will he pardons or condemns. Sins not confessed to the priest cannot be forgiven. What says Scripture? "Who can understand his errors? Cleanse Thou me from secret faults." Ps. 19, 12.

From another quarter comes a voice reiterating the objection of the Pharisee: "Who can forgive sins but God only?" True. In the Lord's Prayer we ask God: "Forgive us our trespasses." The psalmist exults: "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits; who forgiveth all Thine iniquities." Ps. 103, 2. 3. If God does not forgive our sins, we remain under its burden though man absolve us a thousand times. God only can forgive sins. But the question is: How does God forgive sins? Immediately perhaps, by a voice from heaven or by an inner voice in the heart? Luther met such enthusiasts. He writes: "If you do not seek forgiveness of sins in the *Word*, you will gape to heaven in vain for grace, or, as they say, for the inward forgiveness." (*Von den Schlüssen*. St. L. XIX, 1174.) "We should and must firmly maintain that God will not deal with us frail beings except through His external Word and Sacraments. And all that is boasted of independent of such Word and Sacraments (as being the Spirit) is the very devil himself." (*Smalcald Articles*, Art. VIII.)

God forgives sins through the Gospel. Herein the power lies, not in man. "God hath committed unto *us* the word of reconciliation," says Paul. This Gospel has been entrusted to *us* — to *men*, to the Church. "Go ye, preach *the Gospel*," says Christ to *men*. Whosoever believes this Gospel preached by men *has* forgiveness of sins, absolution. To *men* Christ said: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." God forgives sins through the Gospel entrusted to *men*, who are to proclaim: God is reconciled! If it be said man may come to a full assurance of the forgiveness of his sins by the reading of the Word, the answer still is: he received this assurance through *men*, through the Word of the apostles and prophets, not by a voice coming from the skies, nor by an inner revelation. It remains forever true: God, having entrusted "the word of reconciliation" to the Church, thereby has enjoined upon her the duty of forgiving sins.

But still another objection is made by the opposition: To forgive sins man must be omniscient; he must be able to see the state of another man's heart to know infallibly whether a person desiring forgiveness is worthy thereof. We answer: This is a false assumption. Absolution does not pass judgment on the condition of *man's* heart, but it declares the condition of *God's* heart, and this we know: God *is* reconciled. Since God is reconciled with the whole world, there is not a single man on earth to whom the sweet message cannot be brought: God is reconciled also with you. This declaration is valid. God says so. He has given us the "*word* of reconciliation." This *word* man should accept, believe; if man rejects it, that is his fault. "Many do not believe the Gospel, but the Gospel does not lie or fail on that account. A king gives you a castle; if you do not accept the gift, the king has not on this account lied nor failed, but you have deceived yourself, and it is your own fault; the king did certainly give it." (*Luther, St. L. XIX, 946.*)

Finally, in the last analysis, which is the root of all errors with reference to absolution? Says *Dr. F. Pieper* in *Distinctive*

Doctrines and Usages: “The main reason why so many Christians take offense at the practise of absolution is to be found in their inadequate ideas as to what the Gospel of Christ properly is. Their conceptions of the *vicarious work of Christ*, and consequently of the *Gospel* also, fail to come up to the Biblical standard. They think that Christ has brought about so much for us that *we* now, by our conversion, faith, and prayers, render God fully propitious, and thus obtain forgiveness of sins. Hence they conceive the Gospel to be the declaration of certain *conditions* on which God would forgive sins. With many Christians and teachers the Gospel is a mere *plan* to save sinners, Christ having caused in the heart of God a certain *tendency* to forgive sin, men *completing* the change in the heart of God by their being sorry for their sins, by their praying to God for forgiveness, by their earnest endeavors to lead a better life, etc. But these conceptions both of the work of Christ and the Gospel are altogether wrong. Christ has already perfectly and completely reconciled the whole world unto God, and the Gospel, being the message of what Christ has done for mankind, is the ‘word of reconciliation,’ *viz.*, the word stating that God *is* reconciled—*perfectly and completely* reconciled—through Christ to the whole world and every individual sinner. The Gospel is not a word which teaches how *men* might by their own exertions render God fully propitious, but a word which assures us that God *has been* reconciled to all men through the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. Therefore, to preach the Gospel does not mean to lay before men a mere *plan* of salvation, or to declare the *conditions* of forgiveness, but preaching the Gospel is preaching pardon itself, salvation itself, ‘remission of sins’ itself. Luke 24, 47. The Gospel is ‘nothing else than a great letter of pardon directed to the whole world.’ Hence it is that Luther frequently says: ‘A minister preaching the Gospel cannot open his mouth without constantly remitting sin.’ Wherever the Gospel is proclaimed, there absolution is pronounced. *It is from this conception of the Gospel that the Lutheran practise of absolution is to be judged and*

understood. It should be borne in mind also that God has already *absolved* the whole world in laying the sins of the whole world on Christ and in raising up Christ from the dead. With *our* sins upon Him Christ entered into the prison-house of death; absolved from *our* sins He was set free in His resurrection. Hence it is seen that the resurrection of Christ actually involves an absolution of the whole world, and *the absolution we pronounce is nothing but a repetition or echo of what God has long since pronounced.*"

"In short," says Dr. C. F. W. Walther, the American Luther, "the Gospel is a universal absolution, brought from heaven to the whole world by men, sealed with the blood and death of Christ, and confirmed by God Himself most grandly and solemnly in the glorious resurrection of our Savior. And just because the Gospel is an absolution of all men, on account of the perfect redemption of the world, which is already accomplished, therefore also a minister of the Gospel may and shall, in the name of God, assure each and every man who, as a poor sinner, desires forgiveness of the remission of sins. Denying the minister this prerogative is denying him the power of proclaiming the Gospel in its entirety and completeness. For whosoever believes with all his heart that Christ has blotted out the sins of all men, how can he take exception to Christ's minister's saying to a man who professes to believe in Christ, *Thy sins are forgiven thee!*"

As to the great *comfort* afforded by absolution we quote from the *Augsburg Confession*, Article 25: "The people are diligently instructed with regard to the comfort given by the word of *absolution*, and the high and great estimation in which it is to be held; for it is not the word or voice of the individual present, but *it is the word of God*, who here forgives sins; for it is spoken in God's stead and by His command. Concerning this command and power of the keys, it is taught with the greatest assiduity how comforting, how useful they are to terrified consciences, and, besides, how God requires confidence in this absolution, no less than if the voice of God were heard

from heaven; and by this we comfort ourselves, and know that through such faith we obtain the remission of sins."

Finally, if the question be asked, Why is the same grace of God offered and sealed in *several ways*—in the Gospel, in the Lord's Supper, in Baptism, in Absolution? we answer with gratitude towards God in the words of our Confession: "The Gospel affords us more than one means, one counsel and assistance, in opposition to sin; *for God is superabundantly rich in His grace.*"

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

HO ARTOS HO EPIOUSIOS.

AN INQUIRY INTO MATT. 6, 11 AND LUKE 11, 3.

One of the most remarkable achievements of Luther was his translation of the Bible into German. The very fact that this statement has been made so frequently as to render it almost commonplace only goes to show how true it is. Luther's translation of the Scriptures was the first modern Bible-version sufficiently adequate in explication and expression to secure for it a worthy and abiding place on the book market of the world, and by careful revision, ceaseless emendation, and painstaking polishing on the part of the great Reformer and his distinguished coworkers, it has become not only the most satisfactory substitute for, but also by far the most serviceable commentary on, the Greek and Hebrew original, and withal an imperishable masterpiece of hermeneutic art and sound Scriptural interpretation. Unlike the English Authorized Version, which had passed through various stages of gradual development until it was cast into its final form by a select draft of representative scholars, Luther's version was wonderfully competent in its very first edition, though accomplished in a relatively brief space of time and under the stress of the most harassing events, while the final editions published under his supervision were as nearly perfect as human intelligence and assiduity could make them. How well Luther had per-

formed his task is evident from the fact that when modern German scholars attempted a revision of his version, they could make but few essential changes and still fewer real improvements, and in the rare cases where they gained in accuracy, they lost in force, elegance, or general intelligibility, so that to this day Luther's German Bible is still *the German Bible*, dear to the learned and the unlearned as the medium that conveys to them the thoughts and oracles of God in the most satisfactory way.

All this has been said before; and we repeat it merely for the sake of introducing a discussion which is to show how well Luther rendered the original even in places in which the exact meaning of the Greek and Hebrew could not be ascertained beyond doubt. Luther had a rare talent for ferreting out the latent meanings of obscure words and tangled phrases, and withal a prodigious capacity for linguistic comprehension, which, though frequently obliging him to cast the thoughts into new and different molds, preserved his renditions wonderfully true to the original.

In Matt. 6, 11 and Luke 11, 3 we have the Fourth Petition of the Lord's Prayer, a prayer which millions of Christians repeat several times each day. Yet, very few realize or remember that this petition contains a *crux* which has defied the skill and ingenuity of interpreters to this day. While the Lord's Prayer is exceedingly clear in its essential parts, being couched in the simplest terms, which even a child can readily understand, it contains one word the meaning of which has ever puzzled the scholars, from the very time when Jerome pored over the sacred text to the present hour, when the world is full of rare scholarship and philological facilities of every kind.

The Fourth Petition reads, according to Matthew: *Ton arton hemon ton epiousion dos hemin semeron*, while St. Luke has it thus: *Ton arton hemon ton epiousion didou hemin to kath' hemeran*. Though differing slightly in reading, the two petitions contain the same thought, which in general offers no difficulties; for having taught His disciples to ask for

spiritual gifts in three distinct petitions, the Savior now shows them how to pray for temporal things.

"Give us this day our . . . bread." The gift for which the disciples, as well as all followers of Jesus, are to pray, is bread, *ho artos*, which, in its literal meaning, signifies *cibus, e farina cum aqua permixta, compactus et coctus* (Wilke-Grimm). However, in this connection, the expression comprises more than ordinary bread, and not only meat and drink in general, as in 2 Kings 6, 22, but as Luther correctly expounds in his explanation of the petition: "Everything that we need for the support and wants of the body, such as food and drink, clothing and shoes, house and home," etc. Most interpreters have followed Luther in this conception of the word *artos*, and there seems to be no reasonable doubt that this indeed is the *sensus literalis*, the meaning intended by our Savior.

The substantive *ho artos* is modified by the pronoun *hemon*. Hence we are to pray for *our* bread, that is to say, the bread which *we* need for the support of *our* lives, and which in His infinite kindness God allots and vouchsafes to us.

That bread God the Father should *give* us. No matter how hard we have worked for it, the fact remains that we nevertheless owe it to the goodness of a kind Providence. Unless God deigns to grant it to us, we shall never have it, notwithstanding our greatest efforts to secure it.

Hence God must also give us our bread *daily*, and so we are to pray for it, according to the instruction of the Savior. *Semeron* and *to kath' hemeran* mean essentially the same thing: this day, *heute, quotidie*. The meaning thus far is clear. The prayer which Christians are to waft to the throne of God is: Give us this day our bread!

The difficulty lies with the expression by which the noun *ton arton* is further qualified: *ton epiousion*. We should pray not only for our bread, but for our bread which is *epiousios*. And, *Hic Rhodus, hic salta!* What is the meaning and force of that adjective? What further thought does it convey? Why did the Savior add it so emphatically? Again, did Luther

render it correctly when he translated it with *taeglich*, so that we really ask God for that kind of bread which the Savior intended us to solicit of Him?

Nor should we regard these questions as of little significance. We know that *pasa graphe theopneustos kai ophelimos pros didaskalian* (2 Tim. 3, 16), and that *ou dynatai lythenai he graphe* (John 10, 35); and if it is true that *eukopoteron esti ton ouranon kai ten gen parelthein e tou nomou mian keraian pesein* (Luke 16, 17), then each word of the Scriptures must be of the greatest importance, and it is our sacred duty, as interpreters and teachers of God's holy Word, to ascertain what He wishes to teach us by even seemingly unimportant terms. Now if that holds good with reference to the sentence: *Theoi este*, applied to those *pros hous ho logos tou Theou egeneto* (John 10, 35), then it must apply also to the expression *epiousios*, especially in so terse and concise a locution as the Lord's Prayer. *Epiousios* in this connection must have a definite meaning, and one distinguished both from that of the limiting modifier *hemon* and that of the adverbial modifier *to kath' hemeran* or *semeron*; and it must add to *artos* a particular force, different from that of *hemon* and *semeron*. The first is so clear as to require no further proof, and that *epiousios* is, in its literal meaning, not synonymous with *semeron* or an equivalent adjective becomes obvious when we take into consideration that, whenever the *koine* wishes to express something that is in itself, or is done, daily, it does so by using that word which properly means daily (cf. *te(i) diakonia(i) te(i) kathemerine(i)*, Acts 6, 1; *to kath' hemeran anakrinontes tas graphas*, Acts 17, 11), and neither in the *koine* nor in the classical literature of Greece does *epiousios* ever occur in the literal meaning of "daily." *Epiousios*, which is found only in the Fourth Petition, must therefore add to it some particular qualification not contained in the other adjective or adverbial modifiers.

The great question is, What *does epiousios* mean? In determining its meaning, we have hardly any hermeneutical

facilities to direct us, no elucidating context, either *antecedens* or *consequens*, no parallel reading, no *usus loquendi*, in fact, there is scarcely anything definite to shed light upon the term. Even the etymology of the word, in absence of the other helps, is reduced to mere conjecture. Nevertheless, the case is not hopeless, and we hope to be able to show that Luther was right in correcting Jerome's suggestion and restoring the word "täglich" to its place in Matthew, which in its Latin form it there occupied in the *Itala*, before the great western scholar substituted his fanciful, but impossible innovation.

As regards the etymology of *epiousios*, grammarians and lexicographers are divided into two classes, each upholding its own favorite derivation of the word. Grimm, in his *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, puts it thus: "*Epiusios*, on, vox solis locis Mt. 6, 11, Luc. 11, 3, in phrasi *artos epiusios* (. . . *Itala* = panis quotidianus) obvia, quam Origenes ne in vulgi quidem sermone usurpari ideoque ab evangelistis ipsis effectam videri docet. Origene, Hieronymo (solo Matthaei loco *barbare panem super-substantialem vertente*), Theophylacto, Euthymio, Zigabeno praeceuntibus multi, velut Beza, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Ewald, Bleek, Keim, Cremer [addimus: Pfeiffer, Stolberg, Korthold] explicant panem *sustentandae vitae inservientem*, vocem ab *ousia* deducentes e similitudine vocum *exousios*, *enousios*. Sed *ousia* perraro nec nisi in philosophico sermone idem est ac *hyparxis*. . . . Alia exempla praebet Bonitz, Index aristotel., p. 544; plerumque denotat aut *naturam*, *essentiam* (Substanz) aut *opes*, *facultates*, rem familiarem. Quam ob causam Leo Meyer . . ., Kamphausen . . ., quibus Weiss . . ., Keim . . ., Delitzsch . . . assentiuntur vocem ab *epeinai* et proxime quidem a ptep. *epon*, *epousios*, . . . *epontios*, v. infra), *adesse*, repetere atque panem, *qui* — *praesto sit s. suppetat*, intelligere malunt, ut Christum chaldaice *lachma d'chuckkanah* (cf. *lechem chukki*, *portio panis*, Prov. 30, 8) vel similiter dixisse conjiciendum sit." And to quote another authority, we read: "Et de originatione huius vocis, et de eo, quid per *arton epiusion* significetur, ampla est doctorum disceptatio. Stolberg, J. P. Pfeiffer, Kort-

hold, Marckius, qui ab *ousia* deducunt, vertunt *supersubstantialem*, quam vocem Hieronymus pro voce *quotidianum* Versioni Italicae inseruit, hodieque ea in Vulgata legitur, et occasionem praebeuit interpretandi hunc panem de pane spirituali, ipso Christo et gratia Dei. Cui sententiae post plures doctores antiquos etiam favit aliquando Lutherus. . . . *Verum Lutherus mutavit hanc suam sententiam in Catechismis.*"

In these citations we have the view of the first class of very able and distinguished grammarians. They derive *epiousios* from the preposition *epi*, *ad*, and either *ousia* or *epeinai*. Both derivations are grammatically possible, though the first is improbable, and in both cases the meaning would be the same: *panis, qui praesto sit s. suppetat*, hence, *panis necessitatis nostrae, i. e., panis nobis necessarius*, as the ancient Syriac version has it; or "*panis, welches epi ten ousian, das ist, zum Bestehen und zur notduerftigen Erhaltung unsers Lebens, erforderlich ist.*" (Dietrich, *Institutiones Catecheticae*, translated by Dr. Notz.) This view induced Delitzsch, in his Hebrew translation of the New Testament, to render *ton arton ton epiousion* with *eth-lechem chukkeni*, while all modern versions, so far as we were able to verify, have followed Luther's rendition, offering their equivalent for the Latin term "*quotidianum*."

Now, while this derivation is possible and its meaning in accord with the *analogia fidei*, having in its favor even a kind of parallel reading (*sc.*, Prov. 30, 8), it is nevertheless open to criticism and another class of equally reliable grammarians has violently assailed it, offering vital objections. We again refer the reader to Grimm's *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, where we find them stated thus: "*Sed huic sententiae pariter atque antea memoratae, ut alia taceamus, id maxime obstat, quod, etsi littera i in epi in quibusdam vocibus (ut epiorikos, epiorkeo, epiossoma al.) ante vocalem retinetur, semper tamen in epeinai ab eoque deductis epousia, epousiothes, eliditur*"; while the authority whom we quoted above says: "*Et indoli Graecae linguae conformior est derivatio a participio verbi*

epeimi, *renio*, *accedo*, *epion*, *epiousa*, *epion*, sicut *ethelousios* ex *ethelon* est, et ipsae illae voces *periousios*, *homoiousios* etc. a participiis rectius deducuntur, quam ab *ousia*, quia *a-purum*, non in *-ios*, sed in *-odes* vel *-aios* sua derivata format, et *epi* suum iota tunc solet amittere." Hence, the objections to this derivation are purely grammatical, being based on the usual elision of the *i* in words compounded with *epi* and *ousia* or *epeinai*, and on the difference of the termination which according to the regular formation should be *odes* or *aios*. Besides this, the derivation of *epiousios* from *epienai* seems the more natural and logical, a fact which is emphasized by Winer, who says: "Unter den Adjektiven, welche von andern Adjektiven (Partizipien) gebildet sind, finden sich einige bemerkenswerte, naemlich *periousios* und *epiousios*, wie *ekousios*, *ethelousios*, welche aus *ekon* und *ethelon* in der Weise fortschreitend sich herausgebildet haben wie die Feminina *hekousa*, *ethelousa*; *epiousios* aber steht wohl in bestimmter Beziehung auf das Femininum (*he*) *epiousa*, sc. *hemera*, und *artos epiousios* heisst demnach das fuer den folgenden Tag gehoerige Brot." With regard to the derivation of the word from *epeinai* he remarks: "Die grammatisch moeglich waere; vgl. *enousios*." Benseler, in his *Woerterbuch*, defines *epiousios* as "the bread fuer den folgenden Tag bestimmt, 'taeglich,' hinreichend." Stock (*Clavis Ling. S. Novi Testamenti*), after giving the definition: "*panis ad sustentandam substantiam pertinens*," adds the words: "*adveniens, adventitius, accessorius, superveniens*," and supra *eimi* from *ienai*, where he again refers to *epiousios*, he explains the expression in the following way: "*Artos epiousios est panis adventitius, accessorius, superveniens, futurus, qui . . . spirituali nostrae necessitati velut adjicitur atque supervenit. . . . Nam panis, et quicquid nobis alendis sustentandisque necessarium, non est primarium illud, quod petere debemus, sed adventitium quid. Redditur in Vulgata quotidianus. Nec inepte, ut putatur. Nam epeimi significat etiam sequi, succedere. Jam quod quotidianum est, perpetuam habet successionem, ita, ut hesterno hodiernum succedat. Sequenti*

etiam sufficiens tempori est, et ad sequentes etiam pertinet dies, ut panis quotidianus eodem dicatur sensu, quo dici solet: *Er hat seinen taeglichen Unterhalt*, ubi sane non de uno, sed de sequentibus etiam diebus intelligitur. In eadem sententia est Barnesius, nam scribit . . . ita: *ho kath' hemeran bios* idem, qui in litteris nostris, oratione nempe dominica, *epiousios artos* dicitur." To this, however, Stock objects by adding: "Ego vero existimo, interpretationi huic adversari *particulam semeron, quae tum manifeste redundaret,*" and in great despair, apparently, he bids farewell to the puzzling proposition by a suggestion which brings him far away from the etymological meaning of *epiousios*: "Igitur malim *arton epiousion* intelligere de *pane proprio*, ut sententia verborum haec sit: Gib uns heute unser eigenes Brot, von dem wir sagen koennen, dass wir es erworben haben, nicht anderer Leute Brot." Matthew Henry defines *ton arton ton epiousion* as "*the bread for the day approaching, for all the remainder of our lives, bread for the time to come, or . . . bread for our being and subsistence.*" Dietrich discussess the question at length, in his *Inst. Cat.*, and as his discussion sheds some light on the difficult question, we shall quote him in full: "Welches die urspruengliche Bedeutung des Wortes *epiousios* sei, darueber sind die Vaeter geteilter Ansicht. Um die Schwierigkeit zu heben, hat Hieronymus . . . das hebraeische Evangelium Matthaei, welches bei den Nazaraern zu Berrhoea aufbewahrt wurde, nachgeschlagen und darin das Wort *machar* gefunden, welches *morgen* bedeutet, und mit dem Artikel *dimachar*: *das Morgende*. Dann waere der eigentliche Sinn dieser Bitte: *Unser morgendes Brot gib uns heute*. Diese Ansicht zieht Angelus Caninius allen andern vor und sucht sie mit den Worten Christi zu beweisen, mit welchen dieser den Frommen verboten hat, fuer den morgenden Tag zu sorgen. Um uns dieses aengstlichen Sorgens gaenzlich zu entheben, gebiete Christus, man solle den Vater bitten, dass er unserer Schwachheit sich annehme *und uns tags zuvor schon geben wolle, was wir am folgenden Tag beduerfen*. Er fuegt noch hinzu, dass bei keinem griechischen Schrift-

steller *epiousios* bedeute: *taeglich*; auch koenne man es nicht erklæren im Sinne von: zum Bestehen notwendig oder vielmehr von: mehr als zum Bestehen notwendig (*supersubstantialis*); denn dann muesste es lauten *hyperousion* oder *ousiode* oder wenigstens *epousion*. . . . Das ist richtig. Denn das Wort kommt her nicht von *on* und *eimi* (ich bin), sondern von *ion*, dem Partizipium des Zeitworts *eimi* (ich gehe), wovon *epeimi* gebildet ist. Auch findet sich das Wort *epiousios* in der Apostelgeschichte mehrmals in demselben Sinne gebraucht, naemlich 7, 26; 16, 11; 20, 15; 21, 18; 23, 11, wo es heisst *te(i) epiouse(i) hemera(i)*, das heisst: *am folgenden Tag*." But also Dietrich closes his remarks with an admission of defeat by saying: "Doch wir ueberlassen dies den Gelehrten zur genaueren Untersuchung." Grimm summarizes the whole question thus: "Quapropter multo rectius Grotius, Scaliger, Westenius, Fischer, . . . Valckernarius, Fritzsche, . . . Winer, . . . Bretschneider, Wahl, Meyer al. comparatis vocibus *hekousios, ethelousios, gerousios* (ab *hekon, ethelon, geron* pro *hekontios, ethelontios, gerontios*, . . .) adjectivum *epiousios* effictum esse conjiciunt ex *epion, epiousa*, ut respiciatur ad notissimum illud *he epiousa* . . . et *artos epiousios* sit idem ac *artos tes epiouses hemeras, victus ad crastinum diem spectans, i. e., necessarius aut sufficiens*. Optime ita sibi respondent *epiousion* et *semeron* atque ille animi sensus significatur, qui *victu ab uno ad alterum diem sufficiente* pie contentus in petendis a Deo alimentis extremam proxime futuri temporis necessitatem non egreditur. Quae explicatio etiam eo commendatur, quod teste Hieronymo in evangelio secundum Hebraeos vocis *epiousios* locum explevit aram. *mahar*, quod dicitur *crastinus*, unde Christus ipse chaldaice *lah'man di l'mahar* dixisse videtur. Neque precatio ita intellecta menti Christi Matth. 6, 34 expressae adversatur, sed apprime ei congruit; nam summum numen rogare jubentur auditores, ut *ipsis cura diei insequentis adimatur*."

We have quoted the above authorities in order to show not only how difficult the solution of the problem seems to be, but,

above all, to make it clear how much misunderstanding, confusion, and downright ignorance exists on this one expression which daily passes over the lips of millions of Christians. And if that is the case, then the term is certainly worthy of examination and study, in order to find a way in which to make its meaning clear beyond a reasonable doubt if that be possible. Nor are the difficulties insurmountable, if approached in a rational way. The great thing for us to do is, not to increase the height of the mountain by piling others on top of it, a thing that occurs only too frequently in cases of this kind. In order to gain a start, and arrive at a satisfactory meaning of the word, it might be well to ascertain what *epiousios* cannot mean, or at least, is likely not to mean in this connection. Now, in the first place, it is clear that *epiousios* does not mean *transubstantialis*, for that suggestion is an outrage against every rule of sound grammatical interpretation. In the second place, it does not mean *panem necessitatis nostrae*, at least not literally. Prov. 30, 8, though similar in content and form, is not a parallel reading to Matt. 6, 11 or Luke 11, 3; hence we have no right to force the expression *lechem chukki* on *epiousios*, tempted though we may be, and *epiousios*, though we admit the combination of *epi* with *ousia* to be possible, does not mean *panis nobis necessarius*; that thought the *koine* would have expressed in a different and clearer manner. (Cf. Acts 2, 45; 4, 35; Heb. 10, 36; Luke 10, 42; John 13, 29.) In the third place, the derivation of *epiousios* from *epi* and *ousia* is, to say the least, rather improbable, as it is contrary to the usual way adjectives are formed, and involves a twofold deviation from the rules governing such cases, rules which were so deeply rooted in the spirit and nature of the Greek idiom that we can hardly believe that they were transgressed in order to form the new term *epiousios*. If the word would read *epousios* or *epousiodes*, the case would be reversed, and the burden of proof would rest with those denying the derivation. Apart from this difficulty, there is another one of a different kind. Why should we pray so emphatically for *arton epi ten ousian*?

Or is there any bread which is not *epi ten ousian*? We at least know of none. So far as we know all bread is panis sustentandae vitae inserviens. But this is evidently not the meaning which these grammarians wish to have expressed by *epi ten ousian*. Hence Dietrich says: "Zweitens: Brot, welches *epi ten ousian*, das ist, zum Bestehen und zur notduerftigen Erhaltung unsers Lebens erforderlich ist." So *artos ho epiousios* is to convey the idea that we should not pray for *much* bread, or for riches of bread, but only for so much as we need for our *subsistence*. Now, this beautiful thought, so often inculcated upon us in the Scriptures (Prov. 30, 8; Matt. 6, 32, 33; Col. 3, 2; 1 John 2, 15), is already implied in the very term bread; for by teaching us to pray for bread only, which was the staff of life also in ancient times, the Savior obviously intended to show that we are to ask only for *necessary temporal gifts*. Moreover, that thought is contained also in the modifier *hemon*; for *our* bread is evidently the bread which is necessary for our maintenance and support. Even the adverb *semeron* emphasizes that idea; for by petitioning for *daily* bread only, it is clear that we are to ask for only such things as we need *to kath' hemeran*, that is, every day, and that again means that we should not ask to be laden with the thick clay of superfluous earthly goods. These objections obtain also with regard to the derivation of *epiousios* from *epi* and *einai*, in the sense of *adesse*, or *panis, qui praesto sit seu suppetat*. Instead of proving in its favor, the whole petition, with its well-chosen and pregnant expressions, argues against such a derivation.

Now, if *epiousios* cannot be derived from *epi* and *einai* or *ousia*, there is but one other alternative, namely, to derive it from *epi* and *ion*, a derivation which is not only quite possible, but also very plausible and highly probable. In fact, after all has been said, and every *pro* and *con* carefully weighed and considered, this seems to be the only sound etymology for *epiousios*. It impresses itself at once upon the unbiased mind as true, and leaves the impression of truth and credibility, even though reliable authorities incline to the former view. As soon

as we hear the word *epiousios*, we think of a similar expression which we frequently meet with in the New Testament, namely, the term *he epiousa*, either standing alone, or followed by the noun *hemera*. (Cf. Acts 7, 26; 16, 11; 20, 15; 21, 18; 23, 11.) No doubt, Winer is right when he says: "*Epiousios* steht wohl in bestimmter Beziehung auf das Femininum (*he*) *epiousa*, sc., *hemera*." So likewise Grimm with his definition: "*Artos epiousios* est idem ac *artos tes epiouses hemeras, victus ad crastinum diem spectans*"; or Dietrich: "Denn das Wort kommt her nicht von *on* und *eimi* (ich bin), sondern von *ion*, dem Partizipium des Zeitworts *eimi* (ich gehe), wovon *epeimi* gebildet ist."

Still, while this derivation seems plausible, the meaning of *epiousios*, as defined by these grammarians, is not so. This Winer gives as: "*das fuer den folgenden Tag gehoerige Brot*." Now, it is clear that this cannot be the meaning of *epiousios*; for it is inconsistent with the adverbial modifier *semeron*. The question is: Why should God give us the bread of to-morrow to-day? The very expression *to kath' hemeran* or *semeron* implies that we should be satisfied with asking for the bread which we need *to-day*. Nor is Dietrich's explanation satisfactory: "Um uns dieses aengstlichen Sorgens gaenzlich zu entheben, gebiete Christus, man solle den Vater bitten, dass er unserer Schwachheit sich annehme und uns *tags zuvor schon* geben wolle, was wir am folgenden Tag beduerfen." By our praying for the bread of to-morrow we do the very thing against which Christ has warned us in Matt. 6, 34: "*Me oun merimneste eis ten aurion; he gar aurion merimnesei heautes. Arketon te(i) hemera(i) he kakia autes*." Nor does the explanation of Stock convince sufficiently: "*Artos epiousios* est panis adventitius, succedens, accessorius, superveniens, futurus, qui . . . spirituali nostrae necessitati velut adjicitur atque supervenit." That is true enough, still the thought is so foreign to the context, as well as the word *epiousios* itself, that it impresses itself upon the mind as being far-fetched and strained. Again, if we accept Grimm's definition: "*victus ab uno ad alterum diem sufficiens* —

taeglicher Unterhalt," then Stock's objection obtains: "Ego vero existimo interpretationi huic adversari particulam *semeron*, quae tum manifeste redundaret." Hence when *epiousios* is brought into connection with *epiousa*, *the following day*, a meaning results which in some way invariably proves objectionable, and therefore, when Grimm defines *arton epiousion* as "*victum ad crastinum diem spectantem*," he immediately adds: "*i. e., necessarium aut sufficientem*," thus suggesting the same meaning given by those scholars who derive the word from *epi* and *ousia*, and we are as far from a definite etymological meaning as ever.

However, there is one alternative which the above authorities seem to have overlooked, though they were very near it. In order to ascertain this meaning, let us leave the Greek text and try to ascertain the original text of the Fourth Petition. Grimm says: "*Epiousios*, vox, . . . quam Origenes ne in vulgi quidem sermone usurpari ideoque ab evangelistis ipsis *effictam* videri docet." According to Origen, *epiousios* is a word which was not found in the Greek idiom before, but was especially coined, in order to express an idea heretofore clothed in words of another tongue. Now, that language was either Hebrew or Aramaic, presumably the latter; for, no doubt, in His conversation with uneducated Galilean fishermen, whom He had called to be His disciples, the Savior employed that language which they properly claimed as their *langue maternelle*. And that was Aramaic; for although Hebrew was still known to the scribes and doctors of the Law, it was practically unintelligible to the lower strata of the Jewish population at Christ's time. (Cf. the relation of Sanscrit to the popular dialects of India to-day.) Again, when the apostles after Pentecost preached the Gospel of salvation to the Jews in Palestine, and especially in Jerusalem, they used the same language which was dear to the common people, and they reproduced the Fourth Petition — to name a particular instance on which our attention is now concentrated — in *ipsissimis verbis* of the Savior. Hence, thus far Matthew had no difficulties in teaching this petition,

for he used the words of Christ, and these were readily understood by the Jews.

The great difficulty arose when Matthew was to recast his original Hebrew thoughts in a language altogether different from his mother tongue. He had to express thoughts for which there were *no synonyms in Greek*, and had to render words for which he could find no equivalents. The difficulty was all the greater as the original was Semitic, while the new idiom was Aryan. Hence it is clear that the expression *epiousios*, which was unknown in classical Greek, is indeed vox ab evangelista ipso efficta.

However, the question now is: Which was the original expression used by Matthew in either Hebrew or Aramaic, and before this, by the Savior? Dietrich says: "Um diese Schwierigkeit zu heben, hat Hieronymus das hebraeische Evangelium Matthaei, welches bei den Nazaraeern zu Berrhoea aufbewahrt wurde, nachgeschlagen und darin das Wort *machar* gefunden, welches *morgen* bedeutet und mit dem Artikel *di machar*: *das morgende*." This sheds sufficient light upon the original expression to enable us to reconstruct it quite correctly.

But before doing so, we might say a few words about the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, concerning which there are so many legendary reports. The usual claim is that Matthew originally wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, translating it, at some later period, into Greek for the benefit of the Jews living in the Diaspora, and unacquainted with either Hebrew or Aramaic. However, a careful study of the Greek Gospel goes far to convince one that the Gospel of St. Matthew is no translation, but, rather, an original work, conceived and executed in Greek. At the same time Matthew must either have written a Hebrew Gospel Himself, or had it written by some scribe, or it may be that some scribe of his own accord wrote down the Gospel preached by Matthew, giving it the title: Matthew's Gospel. This claim he could rightly put forth, for the Gospel was indeed that of Matthew, as, no doubt, the evangelist narrated the miracles

and works of Christ according to a certain form and outline. As our reason for this conjecture we may state that the legends concerning the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew are too well substantiated as to permit them to be rejected as altogether mythical and spurious.

But to proceed. Jerome then saw a copy of this Hebrew Gospel, and found in it the expression *machar*, or *di machar*, in the place where the Greek text has *epiousios*. The little particle *di* proves that this Hebrew Gospel was really an Aramaic one, and therefore Grimm says: "Quae explicatio etiam eo commendatur, quod teste Hieronymo in evangelio secundum Hebraeos vocis *epiousios* locum explevit aram. *machar*, quod dicitur *crastinus*, unde Christus ipse chaldaice *lahman di l'mahar* dixisse videtur." Grimm's reconstructed Aramaic phrase is no doubt correct, as we shall see anon; but we shall for the present omit the particle *le*. For the report is that Jerome found *machar* only, — at least so much we know definitely, — with possibly the particle indicating the relation of the genitive, *di*. Hence we have *lahman di mahar*, the equivalent for the Hebrew *lechem hammachar*. This, however, is the common Semitic combination of *nomen regens* and *nomen rectum*, which ordinarily expresses the same relation which in the Aryan languages is expressed by the use of the genitive. The question is: What special relation does the *nomen rectum* here have to the *nomen regens*? Many, we know, are possible in cases of this kind. Gesenius-Kautsch says: "Das Nomen rectum stellt dar: a) einen sogenannten gen. subj.; b) einen sogenannten gen. obj.; c) einen sogenannten gen. partitivus; d) einen sogenannten gen. explicativus oder epexegeticus," etc. Now, as we have seen before, the expression cannot mean: *bread of to-morrow*, or *to-morrow's bread*; neither can it reasonably mean: *bread intended for to-morrow*, or: *bread used on the morrow*, for both conflict with Matt. 6, 34 and with the very adverb *semeron* used in the petition. Hence the relation of the *nomen rectum* to the *nomen regens* cannot be that of the

gen. subj. or obj.; but neither that of the gen. partitivus or gen. epexegeticus, as lies on the surface.

There is but one relation left which properly belongs neither to the relation of gen. obj. nor gen. epexegeticus, but examples for which Gesenius has grouped either under the one or the other. We refer to expressions like these: *derech ez hachajjim*, Gen. 3, 24, the way to the tree of life; *derech hajjam*, Is. 8, 23, the way to the sea; *schebuath J'hovah*, 1 Kings 2, 43, the oath directed to Jehovah; *sibchei Elohim*, Ps. 51, 19, sacrifices pleasing to God; *bammajim mei aphsajim*, Ezek. 47, 3—5, water extending to the ankles, to the loins, etc. (Gesenius-Kautsch, Hebr. Gramm., p. 422.) Cf. also Prov. 7, 27; Job 38, 20. Of very special interest is also the expression *lachaz: lechem lachaz umajim* = *Drangsalsbrot, Drangsalswasser*, 1 Kings 22, 27; 2 Chron. 18, 26, cf. Is. 30, 20: *lechem zar* (Gesenius, Woerterbuch, sub. *lachaz*).

Now, in all these cases we have *nomina recta*, which describe something *extending to a certain terminus ad quem* (Ziel). And that seems to be the relation expressed by the expression *lechem hammachar*—*the bread of the morrow*. (Cf. *lechem lachaz* or *lechem zar*.) The meaning would then be: *the bread which extends to the morrow, not from day to day*, as some would have it, but to quote Grimm with a little modification: *panis ad crastinum sufficiens, bread sufficient till to-morrow*—*das bis zum Morgen hinreichende Brot*.

This suggestion readily explains the forming of so unusual an expression as *epiousios*; in fact, there was hardly any other alternative, unless by way of paraphrase. The evangelist found two Greek words, well known and both having definite *usus loquendi*, namely, the verb *epeimi* and the Greek word for the morrow, *he epiousa*, and from this he constructed a new adjective to express the original idea of *bread reaching unto the morrow*. That Grimm so understood the *nomen rectum* is clear from the fact that he added to it the prefix *le*, making the expression read *lahman di l'mahar*; cf. the Hebrew *lechem l'machar* =

bread till the following day. This prefix, however, expresses the *terminus ad quem*, or to use the words of Gesenius: "Es wird gebraucht als das Exponent des Akkusativs (*Zielakkusativ*).” We may add a few German expressions which remind us strongly of the Hebrew combination of *nomen regens* and *nomen rectum*, and express the same relation as the Hebrew expressions. A *Knierock* is a coat extending to the knees; a *Wolkenturm*, a tower extending to the clouds; the *Heimweg* is the way leading to one's home, etc.

But now a new question arises. Why should the Savior teach His disciples to pray for bread *lasting till the next day*, or *bread sufficient to reach as long as the day*? This thought may not have seemed as superfluous to the population of the ancient world as it does to us, but there may be a time, especially if the present prices for foodstuffs should continue to soar in the same ratio as in the recent past, when even American mothers and fathers will learn to pray with ardor and fervency: Give us this day bread enough to feed our little ones till the next day. We Americans are thoroughly spoiled in every way. God has bestowed upon us the riches of His inestimable goodness in so lavish a way that the thought never occurs to us that our bread might not last as long as the day. Our cellars and larders are stored with provisions and supplies of every kind, far in advance of the necessity of using them. Winter approaching, mother puts down immense quantities of preserves, jellies, sweets, and so forth, of every description, while father gets busy buying potatoes and vegetables and flour, etc. And we are not only a rich, but also a very *cautious* and *provident* nation. As a nation we believe in preparedness, if not for war, at least for the satisfaction of the wants of the stomach. Our miserably cold and inclement climate has made us such; for unless we would do this, at least half of the present population of the United States living in the extreme northern States would starve. Now, conditions in Palestine at Christ's time were quite different. The country of the Jews was no

longer rich and productive, but, largely in consequence of economic conditions, it had become wretchedly poor, much as it is to-day, and so were the inhabitants, especially the common people, who later on largely constituted the Christian churches. The evangelists give us a few, but very interesting glimpses into these conditions, and we are deeply moved whenever we read John 21, 3—5: "Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a-fishing. They say unto him, We also go with thee. They went forth and entered into a ship immediately; and that night they caught nothing. But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus. Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat? (Kinder, habt ihr nichts zu essen?) They answered him, No." And this "no" explains the reason why Peter went fishing, and why his fellow-disciples were so eager to go with him. As a matter of fact their provisions were exhausted, and though the evening was come, they had nothing to eat. For people so wretchedly poor, and living so frugally, it meant very much *to have this day sufficient bread to reach till the following one*. Again, the people of Palestine were not only poor, but also very improvident, somewhat, if not very, similar to our Southern fellow-citizens of color. They made no provision for the wants of the following day, even for those of the coming night, just as many negroes and poorer whites do down South. Hence, when the angel of the Lord appeared to Abraham with his two companions, we are told that he hurried to the tent of Sarah, bidding her to make ready three measures of fine meal, and to make cakes upon the hearth, while he himself hastened to the herd to order the shepherd to slay and prepare a calf for the late and unexpected supper of the guests. The fact is that Abraham, though being a wealthy man, had not a morsel of bread in the whole caravansary, and it was well for him to have at least the "makings" of *artos epiousios*. People poorer than he were in a sorer plight whenever unexpected guests arrived. Of this the Savior has drawn a lesson

in Luke 11, 5. 6: "And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say unto him, Friend, lend me three loaves; for a friend of mine in his journey is come to me, and I have nothing to set before him." Such cases may have occurred very often, as the ancient world, especially in the East, was unacquainted with that extremely modern and convenient institution of traveler's delight, the modern hotel, and to this day it is regarded in the East as an unpardonable outrage to refuse a stranger the benefit of bed and board. Hence it must have meant very much to the primitive people of olden times to have *artos epiousios*, *bread sufficient for the day*, and lasting till the next morning, with its new cares and worries and opportunities to work, arrived; and if God should visit our country with times only a little harder than they are now, we may learn to appreciate this thought somewhat better than we do now. However, that meaning impresses itself upon ourselves still more forcibly when we take into consideration the many things that we need for the support and wants of the body, and which are implied in the term *artos*, such as clothing and shoes, house and home, fields and cattle, money and goods, a pious spouse, pious children, pious and faithful rulers, good government, peace, health, discipline, good weather, honor, good friends, faithful neighbors, and the like. Verily, we have every reason to ask God not to deny us these while the day lasts, for we surely have need of them before the next day dawns.

Now, if our suggestion obtains and *epiousios* means *ad crastinum diem sufficiens*, then Luther could find no better word with which to render this thought into modern parlance than the word which he put in substitution for Jerome's translation *transubstantialis*, and "daily bread" is not a vague and indefinite version, but the most accurate and adequate rendering, perfectly expressing the thought which the Savior wished to express by *ho artos ho epiousios*.

Ottawa, Ill.

J. T. MUELLER.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis:—

1. *CHRISTLICHE DOGMATIK*. Von Dr. Franz Pieper. 2. Bd.: Die seligmachende Gnade. Christi Person und Werk. Der seligmachende Glaube. Die Entstehung des Glaubens. Die Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben. XII und 672 pages. \$4.00, postpaid.

The author, we assume, has purposely elected to call his compend *Christian Dogmatics*. We applaud his choice. Koestlin has argued that it is of no moment whether a dogmatician who stands on the confessions of evangelical Christianity calls his Dogmatics "Evangelical," like F. Nitzsch, or "Evangelical Protestant," like Lipsius, or "Evangelical Lutheran," like Thomasius, or "Lutheran," like Kahnis and v. Oettingen, or "Ecclesiastical," like Philippi, or whether he adopts the general title "Christian Doctrine of Faith," like Dorner and Schweizer, or "Christian Dogmatics," like W. Schmidt, or simply "Dogmatics," like Kaftan. Even when these latter titles are chosen, Koestlin holds that the author presents merely the faith of his confessional party. Koestlin argues that Christianity exists only in such separate Churches as the Catholic, the Protestant, the Lutheran, the Reformed, etc. Accordingly, the Christian-ecclesiastical faith and the Christian-ecclesiastical doctrine exist only in the various forms of faith and doctrine. Any dogmatics, therefore, must of necessity be simply the dogmatics of a particular Church, although the author may review the teaching of other Churches, and compare it with that of his own Church. And this, we are told, is a fact not only when the author consciously maintains the historical teaching of his Church, but also when he presents merely the doctrine of faith: he cannot help presenting the doctrine of that society of which he is a member, and within which he discharges the function of a public teacher. "Each individual Church, however, claims to possess in its teaching the purest expression of the original and genuine Christian truth, and to have in the purest and most comprehensive manner realized in the personal ethico-religious conditions of her members, which are most closely connected with their knowledge and doctrine, those things which belong to a true life in God and Christ. Every person, then, who in presenting any real doctrine of faith states what he personally regards in agreement with his Church as firmly established truth, or what he would like to lead men to value as an expression of the truth surpassing all previous forms of the doctrine of the Church, presents not only what according to his conviction his particular Church teaches, still less his own personal views, but he states Christian truth itself in as perfect a form as it has been possible to him to apprehend it." (PRE³ 4, 738.) This view makes any presentation of Christian doctrine subjective, not only as to form, but also as to contents. The Christian teacher states the tenets of his faith not only in his own way, but also to that extent in which he has grasped them. This is certainly

true, and yet Koestlin's argument is specious. Objective truth certainly is declared by subjective agents. To adduce a parallel: All Scripture-truth is objective truth, but all is subjectively expressed. David does not speak like Isaiah, nor John like Peter. Each has his own vocabulary and his own plerophory, but all are alike spokesmen for God. The author of this compend, too, has his distinct style, his system for arranging dogmatical materials is entirely his own, his method of stating a doctrinal fact from a given text or group of texts, of unfolding the contents of an admitted fact, of exhibiting its bearings, and of removing opposition, is markedly idiosyncratic, and yet it is nothing but reiterated Christian truth. Let the reader apply a rather mechanical test like that of counting the *dicta probantia* in a brief chapter like the opening one, on saving grace; let him observe which of these texts are cited more than once, and find the reason for duplicating or triplicating the citation; let him not fail to note that not only the older theologians of the Lutheran Church, but also the very confessions of the Church are measured against the oracles of God step for step, and, last not least, that the truths of natural religion which corroborate revealed truth are accepted because of their corroborative qualities and the findings of pseudo-exegesis and pseudo-dogmatics are rejected because of their divergence from the divine Word,—and the impression is inevitable that it is indeed nothing but the primeval Christian faith, that faith in its completeness, and in its exclusiveness and finality, that is here presented. The book is truly a Christian Dogmatics.

This particular volume, the second in the proposed series of three, contains, moreover, the Christological material in unusual fullness and variety, chiefly because modern Christianity must fight its vital conflicts on this territory, not only because of the still continuing old Reformed opposition, but because of the equally, if not more, destructive error of Protestant neologists, both of whom have seriously vitiated, not to say destroyed, the clear perception not only of the personal aspects, but also of the redemptive acts of Christ. Who of us has not felt with Eduard Boehl, who writes: "In what way are we to be benefited by a Savior such as, *e. g.*, Ullmann has portrayed to us in his *Sinlessness of Jesus?*" He exhibits to us an ideal, a normal man, a wonderful being, a unique person, before whom we cover our face with our hands, but not a Savior of sinners. Such a Savior has absolute impotency written on his face. We behold him passing before us in a certain frame of mind that is wavering between mourning and rejoicing—modern theologians call it *Wehmut*. He is a perfect pattern of perfection; in an exposition of celebrities he would surely be entitled to the first place. But he is such a thorough stranger to us that we involuntarily ask ourselves how the brain must look out of which such a sinless Jesus sprang. Dorner's Christ is, in fact, not better. He is a still greater singularity than that of Ullmann, which thirty years ago used to be lauded to students as a panacea. Dorner's Christ is such a *monstrum* that you desist *a priori* to measure yourself against His greatness. But you are not asked at all to do that; the presentation of this Christ was not made for any such purpose of the old rationalists. You are to marvel! First, at the sagacity of the theologian who has

evolved this Christ; secondly, at the Christ Himself who unites in Himself a disposition for everything divine and human, and by a process permits this disposition to become a reality in the person of the God-man. — A reader who survives the reading of the Second Part of Dorner's *Christian Doctrine of Faith* will reach the conclusion that we have indeed achieved a mighty progress. Upon a crumbling foundation for which the building material neither of the trinitarian teaching of Christianity nor of the old Christology was used, Dorner has by the skill of his eloquence erected a God-man who seemingly answers all the pious demands which Christians make upon the Redeemer. For everything there is here a solution offered: the author speaks of faith in Him, of the atonement, of satisfaction, of justification. But on closer inspection we discover that everything is different from what it used to be in the teaching of the age of the Reformation and in the Biblical and apostolical teaching. Everything has been thoroughly changed, and we find that we are hugging a cloud when we surrender ourselves to these paragraphs and their beautiful phrases which have conjured up the vision before us." Again: "Ritschl rejects all metaphysical distinctions for the doctrine of God and of Christ, and in true Kantian style starts from below: from the effect which something produces in us he draws conclusions regarding the quality and properties of the thing. While Christian dogmatics proceeds in a synthetic way and begins with the objective revelation, Ritschl proceeds analytically and proposes to construe from out of the subject [of the theologian] the formulas to which the person and the work of Christ must submit if they wish to pass muster in our time." (*Von der Inkarnation des goettlichen Wortes*, pp. V. VI, 1.) In the four hundred and eighteen pages of Christology which the author offers us in this volume, we meet with abundant evidence for the justice not only of this, but of hundred similar criticisms upon the old Scriptural teaching concerning the God-man and His vicarious satisfaction. Yea, the author turns the tables on Boehl himself by exhibiting the baselessness, *e. g.*, of a charge like this: "Evidently the Lutheran theology of a later age did not continue building on the foundation laid by the Reformers, but frittered away its strength in mostly fruitless definitions and controversies. This is to be regretted. Neither the teaching of *krypsis* (at Tuebingen at the beginning of the seventeenth century) nor that of *kenosis* (at Giessen) in Christology has aided the human nature of Christ toward a life fruitful for the Church. These restrictions made by the theologians were a bone thrown to reason, which kept gnawing the bone, but the result was *nil*." (*Ibid.*, p. 3.) The treatise on the Kryptic-Kenotic controversy in this compend (p. 337—58) is a little dogmatic cameo. It is the most comprehensive, thorough, and withal illuminating account of this interesting discussion that we have seen in many a day. There is in this section of the book much revolving of fundamental facts, seemingly much repetition, because in the complex theanthropic personality of the Christ there is a permanent interlocking of various concepts, and hardly anything can be said of one concept without affecting some other concept. But the shifting of positive and negative teaching regarding the God-man, though it appears to be

revolving around the same doctrinal point continually, is made so clear and placed before us in such vivid contrasts and with such refreshingly original criticism that this chapter becomes one of absorbing interest. And one loves to think that the title of this book is all the more appropriate because of the exhaustive chapter on the Christ, which forms its central portion.

The last chapter—the account of *gratia applicatrix* in its initial acts, embracing the procreation of faith, or conversion, and justification—takes us back to the old battle-grounds of the Reformation, which, however, are still hotly contested territory, especially with us in America. Every part of the soteriological treatise which is here offered has figured more or less prominently in our late controversy. The study and profound thinking which the heated discussions of the last thirty years entailed are set before us in this chapter in its extensive net results. We become amazed at the grandeur of their importance, and the simplicity of the basic facts on which they rest.

There are nearly 1,600 footnotes in this compend. To the untrained reader of this kind of literature we should suggest that the most profitable way of studying this book will most likely be found to be this: first, read a section, or chapter, of text-matter and disregard the notes. Then take up the notes for separate study, and focus the attention on the particular point of doctrine in the text that is to be elucidated and expanded in the notes. Many of these notes are little doctrinal chapters themselves, and a great amount of most valuable dogmatico-historical information has been crowded into them. One feature of these notes we do not like, *viz.*, that they are numbered consecutively. This is indeed the modern way, and may be a considerable relief to the compositor, but in looking up cross-references—and there are not a few of them—the reader would prefer to have the page indicated to save time.

We are looking forward with keen interest to the publication of the two remaining volumes of this work, which promises to become the *opus palmare* among the learned products of the Concordia press. Vol. III is promised to appear in a few months.

2. GESETZ UND EVANGELIUM: BUSSE UND GUTE WERKE.

(Vornehmlich nach dem 4., 5. und 6. Artikel der Konkordienformel.) Eine Gabe zum 400jaehrigen Jubilaem der Reformation. Von F. Bente. 104 pages. 60 cts.

The din which necessarily accompanied the public celebrations of the fourth centenary of the Reformation has subsided. Retrospection and introspection has commenced. The mind contemplating the spiritual battles of the age of the Reformation becomes centered on the religious principles which clashed in those battles, and disregards the personalities of the combatants, their methods of warfare, their successes and reverses. The Reformation is interesting enough in its secular aspects and bearings, but infinitely more interesting when viewed as the life-struggle of true religion. The movement touched the tap-root of all religious and spiritual life. It went to the core of the Scriptures. It sounded the depths of the human soul. It penetrated to the limits of revelation until it stood face to face with the marvelous mysteries of saving grace. The all

of the inward life of the soul was the stake in this battle. In her *Form of Concord* the Lutheran Church has finally reviewed the conquests of the Reformation struggle, and delimited the basic truths for which her war was waged. The three articles which Prof. Bente has selected for his memorial treatise represent points around which the fight of the Reformers thickened. They are points, moreover, that continue to be assailed, not only by the old foes, but also by mistaken and false friends of the Reformation. To hold the ground at these points is the supreme task of the true children and heirs of the Reformation. The purity and valor of genuine Lutheranism will be tested in every age at the doctrines which are reviewed in this treatise on the cardinal teachings of the Scriptures, Law and Gospel, and on the vital facts of the spiritual life, repentance and sanctification. The perusal of this treatise aptly rounds out our jubilee meditations, and impresses us with its permanent values. It is the treatise we needed to inspire our hearts with a fervent Amen after all that we have heard and read this year. The only regret that we have felt while scanning the 34 lucid chapters of this treatise is, that this book has not been given the Church also in an English edition. If this were done, its mission of usefulness would be increased tenfold.

3. *MARTIN LUTHER. His Life and His Labor for the Plain People.* By Wm. Dallmann. XII and 292 pages. 143 illustrations. \$1.25.

Animated style, significant chapter-headings, a lively movement of the story from scene to scene, and, above all, the lavish use of good and helpful illustrations ought to captivate the "plain people" for whom this book was written and designed. That means—since all our people are plain—that the book ought to secure a place in all our homes and in our affections.

4. *MARGERIE LOVELL. A Tale of the Lollards.* Revised by the Juvenile Literature Board of the Missouri Synod. 105 pages. 45 cts.

This is a stirring and instructive tale, that takes the readers back to pre-Reformation times, to the end of the fourteenth century. It recounts the martyrdom of a follower of Wyclif in England.

5. *AGAINST ODDS. A Personal Narrative of Life in Horse Heaven.* By K. Elizabeth Sihler. 150 pages. 60 cts.

We abhor the sight of a woman with a dog. The frontispiece of this book shows this twentieth century combination. But the vividly told story which is appended to it, and which relates how a woman settler in the West—the author—and her sole companion during five years of struggle against hardships,—her dog "Honey,"—met the daily battle of life, have reconciled us to this instance of an otherwise abnormal companionship.

6. *LITTLE FOLDED HANDS. Prayers for Children.* Compiled by Louis Birk. 48 pages; illustrated. 15 cts.

Under eight heads prayers are here offered that suit all occasions in the life of a Christian child who is raised to love and reverence God and the Savior.

7. *AMERIKANISCHER KALENDER FUER DEUTSCHE LUTHERANER* auf das Jahr 1918. 112 pages. 12 cts.

8. *LUTHERAN ANNUAL*, 1918. 112 pages. 12 cts.

In contents and appearance these two well-known almanacs of the Missouri Synod are equal to their long line of predecessors.

9. *HYMNAL AND PRAYER BOOK*. Compiled by the Lutheran Church Board for Army and Navy of the Ev.-Luth. Synod of Missouri. 89 pages. 15 cts.

51 hymns, 14 prayers, 11 Psalms, the Ten Commandments, Creed, and Lord's Prayer, the General Confession, and the Communion Service constitute the contents of this little booklet of vest-pocket size. On the fly-leaf the soldier may write his name, and facts that may aid in his identification. The book answers the spiritual needs of the soldiers. In a new edition we should suggest that Luther's fine prayer for a soldier be inserted.

10. *THE LORD'S PRAYER*: (Das Vaterunser.) An old melody (1822) with original accompaniment by *Herman M. Hahn*. 2 inside pages. 30 cts.

THE COMMEMORATIVE STATUARY CO. OF BOSTON, MASS. (Dorchester Sta.), has prepared a very attractive bust of Luther. The bust is a reproduction of what is known in Europe as the "Prague" Luther. It represents Luther at the height of his career, determined and energetic. The bust, which furnishes a most appropriate ornament in Lutheran homes, is offered either bronzed or white in a convenient family size (No. 35). For use in churches, halls, and institutions the Company also offers a memorial statue of Luther, which it calls the University size Luther. This statue is 32 inches high and weighs 60 pounds. Concordia Publishing House acts as a depository and receives orders for this statuary. Prices: Family size, No. 35, ivory-finish, \$1.50, postpaid; bronze finish, \$2.00, postpaid; University size, \$25.00.

TEACHER J. WAMBSGANSS, of Long Island City, N. Y. (287 Ninth St.), has published a timely composition, *Soldier, Rest, Thy Warfare O'er*. 15 cts.

Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee:—

1. *LUTHER THE LIBERATOR*. Address by *Rev. William Dallmann*. 43 pages. 5 cts.

2. *WITTENBERG*. Erzählung aus den grossen Tagen der Reformation. Von *O. Hagedorn*. 286 pages. \$1.25.

This work of fiction excels by reason of the dramatic skill with which the author has arranged his scenes, his fine talent as a narrator, and the fidelity to historical facts and conditions which is stamped on the entire story.

3. *ERRETTET UND ANDERE GESCHICHTEN AUS JESU REICH.* Von Carl Manthey-Zorn. Mit Original-Federzeichnungen von Otto Luedecke. 256 pages.

Sixteen well-written, pointed short stories, illustrative of Bible texts and Bible truths, are here offered. They have already found hundreds of grateful readers, and deserve still more.

Wartburg Publishing House, Chicago:—

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF LUTHER RESEARCH. By J. M. Reu, D.D. 27 illustrations. 155 pages. \$1.25.

Ranke's principles of historical research, Janssen's *History of the German People*, and Koestlin's *Life of Luther*—so the author explains—started a host of eager and enthusiastic investigators on their work of searching for facts regarding the life and work of Luther. The results of this research are scattered in many articles that have appeared in scientific journals and in monographs. They have here been gathered, grouped under significant heads, and characterized, and thus a great deal of information has been reduced within easy confines, and the gist of many inaccessible publications has been brought within the reach of many readers. The book serves as a handy reference on many a controverted point in the Reformer's life. It is particularly valuable as an introduction to the literature of special studies of phases and incidents in the life of Luther. Thirteen reproductions of Luther portraits—the twelve Cranachs and a copper engraving by Hopfer—and fourteen facsimiles, mostly of title pages or pages from epochal writings of Luther, adorn this unique contribution to the literature of the Quadricentenary of the Reformation.

DANGEROUS ALLIANCES, OR SOME PEACE SNAGS. By Rev. W. Brenner, Toledo, O. 54 pages. 25 cts. Order from the author, 543 Arden Place, or from H. C. Bitter, 824 Mason St.

This spirited brochure, spite its warlike tone, is a true peace agent. It may be decried as having a divisive tendency, but its aim is the unification of the Lutheran Church. It exposes the elements in the General Council which retard a union among Lutheran church bodies that respect the confessional writings of the Church, and regulate their teaching and practise in accordance with the same. These elements are chiefly two: unionism and lodgism, and these again may be subsumed under the general head of indifference—the former, indifference to the time-honored tenets of Lutherans; the latter, indifference to the Christian religion. That a member of the General Council has had the Christian courage to tell his brethren these things is a most hopeful sign. The first step towards removing an evil is to recognize it and declare it an evil. We are fain to believe that this brochure will start an earnest self-examination and testing of the quality of their faith on the part of the members of the General Council, and lead to the removal of the offensive matters which are pointed out in this brochure.

GRACE LUTHERAN BIBLE SCHOOL OF BEDFORD PARK, N. Y., has issued an artistic edition of its parish paper, *The Grace Abounding*, in commemoration of the Reformation Quadricentennial. The issue contains, amongst others, articles by Prof. Feth on "The Open Bible," by Dr. Kurt E. Richter, "A Pilgrimage to the Wartburg," by the editor on "The Principles of the Reformation," and Dr. Seiss's Memorial Address in 1883 on "The Selling of Indulgences."

The German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa:—

1. *A SYSTEM OF NATURAL THEISM.* By Leander S. Keyser, D.D. 144 pages. \$1.00.

This book is designed as a guide to college students in their study of the existence and attributes of the Divine Being as far as these are known and must be admitted by human reason without the aid of the Scriptures. Chap. I is devoted to a definition of terms and a justification of the study which the book seeks to aid. Chap. II rehearses the main fact with which Theism operates, the universal belief in the existence of God. Chaps. III—VII state the accepted philosophical arguments for this belief: the teleological, cosmological, ontological, moral, and esthetic. Chaps. VIII—XIII are polemic, being directed against Atheism and Materialism, Deism, Pantheism, Idealism, Naturalistic Evolution, Agnosticism, Positivism, and Monism. Chaps. XIV—XVI review the sum total of man's natural knowledge of God, the divine attributes, goodness, and relations. The special literature to which the author refers has been judiciously selected, considering the immediate service which the book is to render to tyros in this study. The arrangement of materials, too, is lucid. The leading statements are brief and compact and, generally, comprehensive. — We question the validity of this distinction: "Christian Theism depends mostly on the supernatural revelation, while Natural Theism depends solely on the light of nature and reason." (p. 16.) The term "mostly" in this statement is confusing. What the Christian accepts as Christian he accepts solely on the authority of Scripture. The Christian has, of course, a natural reason as well as the non-Christian. And the natural reason of a Christian tells him things about God just as the natural reason of a non-Christian tells him such things. But the Christian neither becomes nor is a Christian by his acceptance of the common facts of universal human belief regarding God. If he did, why does not the acceptance of the same facts make the non-Christian to that extent a Christian? Christian Theism can be differentiated from Natural Theism either qualitatively, as regards the degree of clearness and perfection with which facts are apprehended, or quantitatively, as regards the number of facts apprehended. But the ground for differentiation is furnished *solely* by the supernatural revelation. In other words, what the Christian Theist knows of God as a Christian does not depend on the light of nature and reason. — Another matter to which we would call attention concerns not so much this book as the work of scientists. The author defines Theism as a science, but demands the right at times to employ *a priori* methods in his argumentation. (p. 18.) An instance of this is the assumption — to a scientist —

that man was created in the image of God. (p. 23.) True, nearly all scientists do this, but is it not a mischievous practise and a perversion of the very definition of science? If science is *hexis apodeiktike ex anagkaion*, if it operates with *necessary* data, from which it deduces *inevitable* conclusions by processes of *demonstration*, then an unproven proposition is no part of a science, though a scientist may employ an unproven proposition. We say this, not to bicker, but to limit the provoking cock-sureness of some scientists. They forget that the moment they leave the domain of empirical facts they cease to be scientists and cast their own principles to the winds. The limit that is fixed for the natural reason of man is the limit of science. Not infrequently a scientist borrows a basic fact from revelation, and operates with that in the field of his experimental research. That is just as bad a habit as when an author borrows a thought or phrase from another without giving credit. Much of this is done unconsciously, because men have come under the influence of the Christian revelation without being aware of it. They deceive themselves by regarding a remnant of their Christian training which asserts itself in them as a postulate of reason.

2. *GOD'S WORD AND GOD'S WORK.* By *Martin Luther*. 61 pages. 20 cts.

The quotations from Luther's writings which fill this brochure, issued in an attractive cover, express Luther's views of the Bible and of the acts of God in creation and in the Church. They are nearly all of them well-chosen, pertinent, and pithy. Scholars may regret that the sources whence these sayings are taken are not indicated.

The Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia:—

1. *THE REFORMATION IN PRINCIPLE AND ACTION.* A Bird's-eye View of the Reformation. By *Sanford N. Carpenter*. XII and 294 pages.

In ten well-written chapters that arrest and keep the attention of the reader the author tells the story of the Reformation and of some of its effects down to modern times. His presentation takes in not only Luther's work, but the Zwinglian and Calvinian movement in Switzerland, the Huguenot movement in France, the English and Scotch movements, the Thirty Years' War, the Rise of the Dutch Republic, and the decline of Italy and Spain. The book has grown out of sermonic lectures which the author delivered to his congregation. It is a book that offers a wealth of information in very pleasing style.—Calvin's intolerance the author wants to judge charitably by remembering that there was set for him a superhuman task. (p. 152.) But this is hardly charity. Intolerance belongs to the spirit of Calvinism, and has been in evidence in the spread of Calvinistic church bodies.—The author's remarks on the ordination of a pastor (p. 33) we should like to see toned down still more. The commission to preach the Gospel and perform ministerial acts the pastor receives not through ordination, but through the call of his congregation, in which alone the commissioning power resides. The act of ordaining can have no other meaning than to declare publicly and solemnly that the person to be ordained has been com-

missioned, etc. He would be commissioned fully without any ordination. — Regarding the Monroe Doctrine the author says well: "There are many patriotic American citizens who regard the new phases and interpretations of the Monroe Doctrine as one of the gravest dangers which faces our American liberties in the present day." (p. 272.) — We cannot grant the author's statement: "We sympathize actively with the principle of Methodism in its charitable tolerance and sympathy toward all phases of religious conviction other than our own." (p. 213.) Has the author forgotten that the Methodists send missionaries to Sweden and Denmark to convert the Lutherans, and that our Scandinavian brethren in this country had to raise a solemn protest against their proselyting? Has he never met with Methodists who think and speak of Lutherans as unconverted, *because they are Lutherans*? And what has not the American Lutheran Church had to suffer from Methodism in the days when revivalism was in flower! — Does not the author say something that he does not want to say when he declares that for their efficacy the Sacraments "*depend on the faith of the subject who receives them*"? (p. 135.) Whether the subject believes or not, the Sacraments are efficacious. Man's unbelief does not affect the ordinance of God, but only himself. — On the Roman Question the author expresses this sound sentiment:

There are two extreme views in our country as touching the claims of Rome. First, there are those who hold that the claims and present position of Rome constitute a menace, which threatens, at once, to overwhelm the whole fabric of our Republic, and, that "the chief duty of man" now is to fight Rome by fair means or foul. Secondly, there are those who believe that all talk of danger is a false alarm; that we have nothing to fear from the pretensions of Rome, and would do well to yield somewhat in compromise. Both of these extremes are wrong. We have more to fear from the indifference of the latter than from the radicalism of the former.

As long as Rome does not openly and candidly disavow her pretense of temporal power, there is danger, especially in a republican or democratic State like our own country. Here in America the balance of political power becomes daily more delicate. As old parties break up and new ones form, the margin of safety for the party in power becomes ever smaller, and hence the adjustment of power grows more delicate and easily disturbed. Now, it is easy to understand that it is that person or institution or political element which can direct and swing into action a united force which can control the actions of the powers in any delicately balanced political situation, like the small weight on a see-saw. It is, therefore, altogether a question of two factors: how much the party in power is willing to yield in order to get the decisive vote, on the one hand, and the ability of the Roman Catholic Church to unite her political forces, on the other. Of this last we are not certain; but every "good" Catholic will, in the last analysis, be found voting in the interest of his religious convictions, especially if, in his opinion, other things are equal.

The Pope at Rome would fain find opportunity to install a formal ambassador or Nuncio at Washington, and to have our Government set up the court of a United States Embassy at Rome. This could occur only if our Government were turned into a Catholic court. Both President Taft and President Roosevelt sent informal representatives as well as formal official addresses to the Pope. In 1912, President Taft furnished an army and navy escort for Cardinal Gibbons and his brilliant pageant at the unveiling of the Columbus Monument in Washington, D.C. There is no reason in the Constitution of the United States or in the laws of the land

why the humblest pastor should not be granted the same escort upon his bare request. A few years ago, at a State and military parade in Boston, the Roman Cardinal insisted on preceding the governor of the State—a request which the governor indignantly and rightly denied. When the Pope secures his cherished wish to exchange ambassadors with our Federal Government, then will we as a nation have gone to Canossa just as really as Henry IV did in 1077. We would then bow in supplication at the court of Rome. The beginning of the end of our boasted civil and religious freedom would be ushered in, and the sunset gleam of our real national independence would purple the sky. May God preserve us from the perils of that day!

2. *THE SINGING WEAVER, AND OTHER STORIES.* Hero Tales of the Reformation. By *Julius and Margaret Seebach*. Illustrations by *Jessie Gillespie*. 288 pages. \$1.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

One of the authors of the ten charming tales in this book has become so favorably known through her "Martin of Mansfeld" as an author of much literary grace and power that a further introduction is not necessary. The general scope of the stories in this book is to show what share women, children, and common folk had in the work of the Reformation.

3. *PROCEEDINGS OF THE FORTY-EIGHTH CONVENTION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD* of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America in session at Chicago, Ill., June 20—27, 1917.

This bulky document of 567 pages, of which 163 are devoted to statistics of parishes, is important because of the action taken on the question of union with the General Council and the United Synod in the South. The President's report on this matter, which was adopted, was as follows:—

The most significant ecclesiastical event in the present year in the history of the Lutheran Church in America is the actual union of several Norwegian synods in one body with a membership of 300,000 communicants. It is the privilege of the General Synod in the present convention to hasten the consummation of a still larger union by cordially endorsing a projected merger of the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod in the South in one great body with a membership of over 900,000.

These bodies are of common origin, with a similar development and of like faith. For thirty years they have cooperated with each other, and have now a common book of worship. They have exchanged delegates, and have frequently expressed the most fraternal sentiments. The walls which have separated us for the past half century have crumbled, and the pastors and people of the three bodies are on terms of the closest friendship.

It is, therefore, not surprising that in this four-hundredth anniversary year of the Reformation there should have arisen a strong, spontaneous, and well-organized movement for consolidation.

At the meeting of the Joint Quadricentennial Committee, held in Philadelphia, April 18, 1917, the sentiment prevailed that the noblest memorial of the four-hundredth anniversary would be the merging of the three general bodies represented. Accordingly, the Presidents of these bodies, who were present, were requested to form a committee at once for the purpose of formulating a constitution, with an adequate doctrinal basis, and present the same to their respective bodies at their next meetings.

The committee of the General Synod is composed of Drs. Singmaster and Manhart, the President and the Secretary of the General Synod, together with Drs. J. A. Clutz, D. H. Bauslin, E. K. Bell, J. S. Simon, Rev. S. W. Herman, and the Hon. John L. Zimmerman.

The Joint Committee met on several occasions and formulated a constitution, which is herewith presented, and of which a copy is in the hands of each delegate.

For myself and the entire committee I disavow any intention of forcing this constitution on the Church. Nor do we claim any further authority for what has been done than obedience to our own consciences, and to what seems to be

the demand of the Church. The constitution is submitted to the sober consideration of this body, whose responsibility in dealing with it as the first of the three bodies is peculiarly important. It seems to me that your attitude toward it will decide for the immediate future the fate of the merger.

The proposed union is in entire harmony with the history, genius, and avowed design of the General Synod. It was founded for the express purpose of bringing together the Lutheran synods in this country; and though it has only measurably succeeded in doing this, it has never lost sight of the desired end. Its constitution declares that "it shall be sedulously and incessantly regardless of the circumstances of the times, and of every casual rise and progress of unity of sentiment among Christians in general, in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity, and the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, may not pass by neglected and unavailing." Moreover, practically all of the District Synods embraced in the proposed merger are now, or have been in the past, constituents of the General Synod.

In regard to the proposed constitution it should be said that, as far as I can see, there is nothing in its doctrinal basis or its provisions for carrying on the affairs of our Church which is out of harmony with the present constitution of the General Synod. There are some things in it which may not seem necessary or important, but it must be remembered that union in principles generally involves concessions in non-essentials. The experience of our sister bodies may demand certain provisions which do not directly concern us. Moreover, the General Synod has always had a long and detailed Formula of Government which the other bodies do not have. These facts account for the greater prolixity of the proposed constitution.

After all, a union must start with some clearly outlined basis of belief and of work. It is only a temporary document, which can be brought into fullest accord with the needs of a body as they shall arise from time to time.

If a union is to be consummated within the next two years, it is evident that none of the constituent synods can revise the constitution presented. They cannot adopt it in part. They will have to give absolute assent to it as it now stands. This is not arbitrary, but inheres in the nature of the case. If there be anything radically amiss in the constitution, it should be rejected as a whole, and the work of reconstruction begun anew.

In regard to the mode of procedure I trust I shall not be deemed presumptuous if I make the following suggestions, subject to your revision.

It should be clearly understood that the proposed merger shall not affect the ownership, character, or standing of the seminaries, colleges, academies, or like institutions which are operating under distinct charters. Whatever experience may suggest as time goes on will have to be determined by future legislation.

In regard to the method of procedure I venture to propose the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That the General Synod hereby approves the proposed constitution of the United Lutheran Church in America, authorizes and directs its submission to the District Synods at their next conventions, and most heartily recommends its adoption.

2. *Resolved*, That if at least two-thirds of the District Synods of the General Synod shall ratify this constitution, and if it shall appear that it has been ratified also by the District Synods of the General Council and of the United Synod in the South, then the next convention of the General Synod shall be held on the second Tuesday of November, 1918, beginning at 8 P. M., at such place as shall be determined, and shall continue in session for about two days, after which it shall dissolve, and merge in the United Lutheran Church in America, whose first convention shall then and there begin.

If, however, the District Synods of neither the General Council nor the United Synod in the South shall ratify this constitution, the ratification thereof by the District Synods of the General Synod shall be considered null and void. In view of such a contingency the General Synod shall make provision for its usual biennial convention.

3. *Resolved*, That in order to effect the union in accordance with legal requirements, to avoid possible confusion and without destroying in the least the nature and provisions of this constitution, the following be inserted in Article V, "*Delegates*" at the conclusion of the first sentence, following the words "and one lay delegate," *viz.*:—

"And provided further that the delegates, elected by the synods to the last conventions of the general bodies to which they respectively belong held prior to the first convention hereunder, shall be, and they are, in the adoption hereof chosen by their respective synods as their duly elected delegates to said first convention hereunder, irrespective of the basis of representation upon which they were chosen."

4. *Resolved*, That the President of the General Synod be hereby directed to appoint a committee of seven, of which the President and the Secretary shall be *ex officio* members, to be known as the *Committee on Ways and Means*, in the event that the constitution be ratified, or as a *Continuation Committee* in case it be not ratified.

The duties of the Committee on Ways and Means shall embrace the following:—

(a) To inquire into the legality of the entire matter of union, and, if necessary, employ legal counsel.

(b) To be the arbiters to whom all questions shall be referred.

(c) To form with similar committees appointed by the other general bodies a Joint Committee on Ways and Means, to which must be referred the agreements between the several boards and societies for final decision, and which shall arrange and perfect all the details incident to the formation of the union and the holding of the first convention.

5. *Resolved*, That the boards and societies and other agencies of the General Synod whose consolidation with similar boards, societies, and agencies in the other bodies is contemplated in this union, shall, upon its ratification, proceed at once to take the needed steps to effect mergers, subject to the approval of the Committee on Ways and Means. They shall pursue a generous course in dealing with the other bodies, but at the same time they shall see to it that the respective interests which they hold in trust receive equitable consideration.

And they are also hereby charged and instructed to carry on their usual work with zeal and without interruption until it can be safely transferred.

The Constitution of the United Lutheran Church in America reads as follows:—

PREAMBLE.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Having been called by the Gospel and made partakers of the grace of God, and, by faith, members of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, and, through Him, of one another,

We, members of Evangelical Lutheran congregations in America, associated in Evangelical Lutheran synods, recognizing our duty as people of God to make the inner unity which we have with one another manifest in the common confession, defense, and maintenance of our faith, and in united efforts for the extension of the kingdom of God at home and abroad; realizing the vastness of the field that God has assigned us for our labors in this Western world, and the greatness of the resources within our beloved Church, which are only feebly employed for this purpose; conscious of our need of mutual assistance and encouragement; and relying upon the promise of the divine Word that He who hath begun this work will perfect it until the day of Christ Jesus,

Hereby unite, and now invite, and, until such end be attained, continue to invite all Evangelical Lutheran congregations and synods in America, one with us in the faith, to unite with us upon the terms of this Constitution, in one general organization, to be known as THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA.

CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I: NAME.—The name and title of the body organized under this Constitution shall be: THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA.

ARTICLE II: DOCTRINAL BASIS.—*Section 1.* The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God and as the only infallible rule and standard of faith and practise, according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.

Section 2. The United Lutheran Church in America accepts, the three ecumenical creeds: namely, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, as important testimonies drawn from the Holy Scriptures, and rejects all errors which they condemn.

Section 3. The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the faith and doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, founded upon the Word of God; and acknowledges all churches that sincerely hold and faithfully confess the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession to be entitled to the name of Evangelical Lutheran.

Section 4. The United Lutheran Church in America recognizes the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Large and Small Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord as in the harmony of one and the same pure Scriptural faith.

ARTICLE III: PRINCIPLES OF ORGANIZATION.—In accordance with the foregoing Doctrinal Basis, The United Lutheran Church in America sets forth and declares the following principles as fundamental to its organization:—

Section 1. All power in the Church belongs primarily and exclusively to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church. This power is not delegated to any man or body of men.

Section 2. All just power exercised by the Church has been committed to her for the furtherance of the Gospel through the Word and Sacraments, and is conditioned by this end, and pertains to her as the servant of Jesus Christ. The Church, therefore, has no power to bind the conscience, except as she teaches what her Lord teaches, and faithfully commands what He has charged her to command.

Section 3. Congregations are the primary bodies through which power committed by the Church is normally exercised.

Section 4. In addition to the pastors of churches, who are *ex officio* representatives of their congregations, the people have the right to choose representa-

tives from their own number to act for them under such constitutional limitations as the congregations may approve.

Section 5. The representatives of congregations convened in synod and acting in accordance with their Constitution are, for the ends defined in it, representatively the congregations themselves, and have the right to call and set apart ministers for the common work of all the congregations; whose representatives they thereby become, and as such also members of the synod.

Section 6. Congregations representatively constituting the various synods may elect delegates through those synods to represent them in a general body, all decisions of which, when made in accordance with the Constitution, bind, so far as the terms of mutual agreement make them binding, those congregations and synods which consent to be represented in the general body.

Section 7. In the formation and administration of a general body, the synods may know and deal with each other only as synods. In all such cases the official record is to be accepted as evidence of the doctrinal position of each synod, and of the principles for which alone the other synods are responsible by connection with it.

ARTICLE IV: MEMBERSHIP.—*Section 1.* The United Lutheran Church in America at its organization shall consist of the congregations that compose the Evangelical Lutheran synods which have been in connection with the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America, the General Council of the Lutheran Church in North America, or the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South, and which accepts this Constitution with its Doctrinal Basis as set forth in Article II.

Section 2. Any Evangelical Lutheran synod applying for admission, which has accepted this Constitution with its Doctrinal Basis, as set forth in Article II, and whose Constitution has been approved by the Executive Board, may be received into membership by a majority vote at any regular convention.

ARTICLE V: DELEGATES.—*Section 1.* Each synod connected with The United Lutheran Church in America shall be entitled to representation at its conventions by one ordained minister and one layman for every ten pastoral charges, or major fraction thereof, on its roll; provided, however, that each synod shall be entitled to at least one ministerial and one lay delegate; and provided, further, that the delegates elected by the synods to the last conventions of the general bodies to which they respectively belong, held prior to the first convention hereunder, shall be, and they are, in the adoption hereof chosen by their respective synods as their duly elected delegates to said first convention hereunder, irrespective of the basis of representation upon which they were chosen. The ratio of representation may be changed at any regular convention of The United Lutheran Church in America by a two-thirds vote, provided that notice of the proposed change has been given at the preceding regular convention.

Section 2. Each synod shall choose its delegates in such manner as it may deem proper. The delegates from each synod shall elect one of their own number as chairman, unless the synod itself has designated the chairman.

ARTICLE VI: OBJECTS.—The objects of The United Lutheran Church in America are:—

Section 1. To preserve and extend the pure teaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the Sacraments. (Eph. 4, 5, 6; The Augsburg Confession, Article VII.)

Section 2. To conserve the unity of the true faith (Eph. 4, 3—16; 1 Cor. 1, 10), to guard against any departure therefrom (Rom. 16, 17), and to strengthen the Church in faith and confession.

Section 3. To express outwardly the spiritual unity of Lutheran congregations and synods, to cultivate cooperation among all Lutherans in the promotion of the general interests of the Church, to seek the unification of all Lutherans in one orthodox faith, and thus to develop and unfold the specific Lutheran principles and practise, and make their strength effective.

Section 4. To awaken, coordinate, and effectively direct the energies of the Church in such operations as the following:—

(a) The training of ministers and teachers to be witnesses of the Word.
(b) The extension of the kingdom of God by Home, Foreign, and Inner Missions.

(c) The proper regulation of the human externals of worship, that the same, in character and administration, may be in keeping with the New Testament and the liberty of the Church, and may edify the Body of Christ.

(d) The appointment of editorial committees or editors of church-papers and Sunday-school literature.

(e) The preparation and publication of such literature as shall promote the dissemination of knowledge as to the doctrines, practise, progress, and needs of the Lutheran Church.

(f) The creation, organization, and development, through boards and committees, of agencies to carry on all departments of work.

Section 5. To lay apportionments, and to solicit and disburse the funds necessary for these and other purposes defined in this Constitution.

Section 6. To foster and develop the work of synods, to exercise a general supervision of the Church, and on appeal of synods to give counsel, and to adjudicate questions of doctrine, worship, and discipline.

Section 7. To enter into relations with other bodies in the unity of the faith, and to exchange official delegates with them.

ARTICLE VII: CONVENTIONS. — *Section 1.* A convention of the duly elected delegates of The United Lutheran Church in America shall be held at least once in every two years, at such time and place as may be determined by the preceding convention of the body, or by the Executive Board.

Section 2. Special conventions shall be called by the officers at the request of two-thirds of the members of the Executive Board, or at the request of the presidents of a majority of the synods. The delegates shall be those who represented the synods at the previous regular convention, provided they have not been disqualified by removal or by the election of new delegates. Vacancies in delegations shall be filled according to the rules of the respective synods.

Section 3. A majority of the delegates representing a majority of the synods shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VIII: POWERS. — *Section 1: As to External Relations.* The United Lutheran Church in America shall have power to form and dissolve relations with other general bodies, organizations, and movements. To secure uniform and consistent practise, no synod, conference, or board, or any official representative thereof, shall have power of independent affiliation with general organizations and movements.

Section 2: As to Internal Relations. The United Lutheran Church in America shall have power to deal with internal matters that affect all its constituent synods or the activities of The United Lutheran Church as a whole, except that, when the operation of such power takes place within the domain of any of the synods, their consent and cooperation must first be secured.

Section 3: As to Intersynodical Dealings. The United Lutheran Church in America shall have power to address and counsel its constituent synods for the promotion of intersynodical harmony. Any question of interpretation of law, rights, or principle that comes within its jurisdiction, or any proper cases referred to it on appeal of a synod, shall be determined by a Commission of Adjudication hereinafter provided for.

Section 4: As to Individual Synods and Specific Cases. If synods have had due and legal opportunity to be represented in the conventions of The United Lutheran Church in America, they are bound by all resolutions that have been passed in accordance with this Constitution. But each synod retains every power, right, and jurisdiction in its own internal affairs not expressly delegated to The United Lutheran Church in America.

Section 5: As to Doctrine and Conscience. All matters of doctrine and conscience shall be decided according to the Word of God alone. If, on grounds of doctrine or conscience, the question be raised as to the binding character of any action, the said question shall be referred to the Commission of Adjudication. Under no circumstances shall the right of a minority be disregarded, or the right to record an individual protest on the ground of conscience be refused.

Section 6: As to the Maintenance of Principle and Practise. The United Lutheran Church in America shall protect and enforce its Doctrinal Basis, secure pure preaching of the Word of God and the right administration of the Sacraments in all its synods and congregations. It shall also have the right, where it deems that loyalty to the Word of God requires it, to advise and admonish concerning association and affiliation with non-ecclesiastical and other organizations whose principles or practises appear to be inconsistent with full loyalty to the Christian Church; but the synods alone shall have the power of discipline.

Section 7: As to Books of Devotion and Instruction, etc. The United Lutheran Church in America shall provide books of devotion and instruction, such as liturgies, hymn-books, and catechisms, and no synod without its sanction shall publish or recommend books of this kind other than those provided by the general body.

Section 8: As to Work and Administration. The United Lutheran Church in America shall have the power to engage in the work described under "Objects" (see Article VI), to create and regulate boards and committees, to determine budgets, and to lay apportionments.

Section 9. The executive power of The United Lutheran Church in America shall be vested in the officers of the general body, in an Executive Board, and in various other boards for special purposes, subject to this Constitution and the conventions of the general body.

ARTICLE IX: OFFICERS. — *Section 1.* The officers of The United Lutheran Church in America shall be: a President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall be elected by ballot at each regular convention, and shall serve until their successors are elected. The President, who shall be an ordained minister, and the Secretary shall be chosen from the delegates present.

Section 2. The President shall preside at all sessions of the convention, shall have the appointment of committees, unless The United Lutheran Church otherwise direct; shall see that the Constitution be observed and resolutions carried out; shall sign all official papers, and shall discharge such other duties as are delegated to him by the convention.

Section 3. The Secretary shall keep a record of the proceedings, attest all documents of the body, and publish the time and place of the next meeting at least two months in advance. In case of a special meeting he shall give a written

notice thereof to the President of each of the synods immediately upon the issue of the call, and shall publish the same at least thirty days in advance of the meeting.

Section 4. The Treasurer shall receive and disburse all moneys, and keep an account of all his transactions, and submit a report of the same at each regular convention. He shall make disbursements only upon the order of the President, attested by the Secretary. He shall be required to give corporate surety in such amount as shall be determined by the Executive Board.

Section 5. In the event of the death, resignation, or incapacity of any officer, in the interim between conventions, the Executive Board shall fill the vacancy.

ARTICLE X: INCORPORATION.—The United Lutheran Church in America shall be incorporated.

ARTICLE XI: THE EXECUTIVE BOARD.—*Section 1.* The Executive Board of The United Lutheran Church in America, which shall also be its Board of Trustees, shall consist of the President, the Secretary, and the Treasurer of the general body, who shall also be the officers of the Executive Board, together with six ministerial and six lay members, who shall be elected by the general body for a term of four years.

Section 2. At the first election three ministerial and three lay members shall be elected to serve four years, and three ministerial and three lay members to serve two years. Thereafter three ministerial and three lay members shall be elected at each regular convention to serve four years.

Section 3. The Executive Board shall meet at stated times. It shall be the duty of the Executive Board to represent The United Lutheran Church in America, and to carry out its resolutions, and attend to its business during the interim; it shall coordinate the work of the executive departments, receive reports as to the work and needs of the several Boards, present a budget to the conventions with apportionments, fill vacancies not otherwise provided for, and perform such other work as may be delegated to it by the general body, to which it shall make full report of its acts.

ARTICLE XII: COMMISSION OF ADJUDICATION.—*Section 1.* A Commission of Adjudication shall be established, to which shall be referred, for interpretation and decision, all disputed questions of doctrine and practise, and this Commission shall constitute a court for the decision of all questions of principle or action arising within The United Lutheran Church in America, and which had been properly referred to it by resolution or by appeal of any of the synods.

Section 2. This Commission of Adjudication shall consist of nine members, six ministers and three laymen, learned in the doctrine, the law, and the practise of the Church. All of the members of this Commission shall be elected at the first convention of The Lutheran Church in America, two ministers and one layman for a period of six years, two ministers and one layman for a period of four years, and two ministers and one layman for a period of two years. As their terms expire their successors shall be elected at each convention for a term of six years.

Section 3. The Commission shall elect its own officers, and shall meet at least semiannually for the transaction of business. When it holds meetings, or renders decisions, due notice of the time and place of meeting shall be given by its Secretary to all persons interested, and a standing notice of the time and place of its regular meetings shall be published in the church-papers.

Section 4. The consent of at least six members shall always be necessary for a decision.

Section 5. The Commission shall render a written report of all its actions and decisions to the next regular convention, but the right of appeal from its decisions shall always be recognized.

ARTICLE XIII: BOARDS.—*Section 1.* The United Lutheran Church in America shall determine the number of members in the several boards which it shall create, and these boards shall always be amenable to it.

Section 2. All members of boards shall be elected by The United Lutheran Church in America. Vacancies occurring in any board *ad interim* shall be filled by the Executive Board of the Church on nomination of the board in which the vacancy exists. No person shall be a member of more than two boards at one and the same time. No member of any board, including the Executive Board, shall be a member of the Commission of Adjudication; but the President of The United Lutheran Church shall at all times have a seat and a voice in all the boards and in the Commission of Adjudication.

Section 3. These boards, upon the determination of the general body, shall secure articles of incorporation which must be in harmony with the purposes of The United Lutheran Church in America; but no board shall apply for incorporation until its proposed charter shall have received the approval of the general body in convention, or, in the interim, of the Executive Board.

Section 4. The boards, unless otherwise provided, shall have power to elect their own officers and employees, and to carry on their work in accordance with the design of their appointment. No member of a board shall be a salaried employee thereof.

Section 5. The boards shall require corporate surety from their respective treasurers. At each regular convention of The United Lutheran Church in

America they shall render full and accurate reports of their work during the preceding biennium.

Section 6. The Woman's Missionary Society, as auxiliary to boards of The United Lutheran Church in America, shall have the right to appoint two women as advisory members of each of the missionary and benevolent boards to the support of whose work they regularly or officially contribute.

ARTICLE XIV: SYNODS. — *Section 1.* No synod in connection with The United Lutheran Church in America shall alter its geographical boundaries without the permission of the general body.

Section 2. Synods shall give advice to their ministers and congregations concerning doctrine, life, and administration, and shall exercise such disciplinary measures as may be necessary.

Section 3. The Presidents of synods shall exercise an oversight of the pastors and congregations composing their respective synods, and shall be charged with the duty of carrying out the rules and regulations adopted by the synods. When requested by the Executive Board, they shall appear before it to represent their synods. They may also make suggestions to the Executive Board, or seek its advice, with respect to the conditions and work in their synods.

Section 4. Should any synod in connection with The United Lutheran Church in America desire to continue its established lines of work for reasons satisfactory to the general body, such privilege may be granted.

ARTICLE XV: COMMITTEES, BY-LAWS AND AMENDMENTS. — *Section 1.* The United Lutheran Church in America may appoint special and standing committees. It may adopt by-laws for the transaction of its business, provided that they do not conflict with this Constitution. These by-laws may be suspended or amended at any convention by a two-thirds vote.

Section 2. Amendments to this Constitution must be presented in writing at a regular convention of The United Lutheran Church in America, which shall decide by a two-thirds vote whether and in what form they shall be submitted to the Synods. An exact copy of proposed amendments shall be transmitted by the Secretary to the presidents of the synods for submission to their respective bodies. If at a subsequent convention two-thirds of the synods shall report their approval of the amendments proposed, they shall be declared adopted.

We have given space to these documents for the sake of having them available for future reference, and to invite reflection and discussion. For this body has also adopted the following report of its secretary: —

Your representative to arrange, with others, if found practicable, for the holding of another Free and General Conference of Lutherans in America, respectfully submits the following: —

1. It is the understanding that when another conference is held, men from various Lutheran bodies, other than those from which men came to the three conferences that have been held, will be free to participate.

2. There has been expressed, in many of the leading Lutheran periodicals and by individuals, the opinion that such a Free General Conference should be held in the latter part of this quadricentennial year. So far as the three bodies which are included in the proposed merger are themselves concerned, there is no call for such a conference. If, however, it should appear that there is sufficient interest and desire in and for a conference on the part of men connected with other Lutheran bodies, then such a conference could profitably be held, and men from the three bodies should, and doubtless would, be willing to cooperate.

3. It should be understood that the representative of the General Synod in this matter may, at his judgment, confer with men connected with our various Lutheran bodies, and visit synodical meetings in the interests of another Free General Conference of Lutherans in America on the broad basis heretofore outlined and approved.

Joint Lutheran Committee on Celebration of the Quadricentennial of the Reformation, Philadelphia: —

PROTEST AND PROGRESS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

By Carolus P. Harry. 162 pages.

Adopting the method of the Mission Study Books for classes organized for the purpose of study, the author submits materials for studying the life of Luther in eight chapters. A table of questions at the end of each chapter serves to test the results of the pupil's study. We regard this method as a very good one.

Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.:—

1. *SERMONS ON THE CATECHISM*. Vol. II. The Apostles' Creed. By R. E. Golladay. X and 461 pages. \$1.50.

In Vol. XX, p. 52 f., we mentioned the first volume in this promising series of *Sermons on the Catechism*. The greater majesty of the subjects discussed in this volume is reflected in the discussion. After two introductory sermons on creeds and The Creed, the author presents 10 sermons on the First, 15 on the Second, and 11 on the Third Article. The sermons are well written, clear as regards the arrangement of materials and the sequence of thoughts, pleasing and plain as regards style, and full of doctrinal meat for the building up of the full-grown man according to the stature of Christ. We reiterate the thought expressed at the time the first volume of this series was announced: the publication of this kind of literature is one of the most hopeful signs of the times, and promises much for the Lutheran Church of the future.—The author should reexamine a remark on page 344, where he speaks of the call of grace as possibly having come to Israel "with the thunders of Sinai." The call of which the Third Article speaks is "by the Gospel," and only by that. The term "with" in the author's statement is liable to be misunderstood. In the same sermon, on page 346, the effect of the call is described as "coming out more and more decidedly on God's side." For the sake of poor souls who need the Gospel in all its plainness and fulness, this should be made to read: who "come out on God's side," or still better: "who accept the Gospel." The terms "more and more" and "decidedly" weaken the description of this glorious act of the Holy Spirit. The first spark of faith—so our Church teaches—decides this whole business.

2. *THE POPE'S CATECHISM*, or, The Teachings of Roman Catholicism Made Plain for Protestants. By Rev. J. Sheatsley. 188 pages. 75 cts.

The errors of Rome are in this book presented in authoritative form from Deharbe's *Large Catechism*, and ably refuted under these heads: The Church, The Pope, The Priesthood, The Work of Christ, The Rule of Faith, The Means of Grace, Faith, Justification, Good Works, Prayer, Purgatory.

3. *WALKING TRIPS IN NORWAY*. By N. Tjernagel. 269 pages. \$1.00.

This is a truly delightful volume of reminiscences of an American traveler who goes on a visit to his ancestral home in Norway.

4. *THE LUTHERAN CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE JUBILEE YEAR 1917*. By C. C. Hein. English and German. 12 pages each.

This is a special print of the opening address delivered before the Western District of the Ohio Synod at its convention at Dayton, O., October 10, 1917, by its President. The address culminates in the recommendation of free conferences and the adoption of a resolution to that effect, for the purpose of bringing about "a better understanding among the Lutheran synods of America, especially with those synods with whom we already have a closer relation."

5. *COME TO BETHLEHEM*. 28 pages. \$3.75 per 100.
6. *FROEHLICHE, SELIGE WEIHNACHTSZEIT!* 30 pages. \$3.75 per 100.

Two liturgical programs with music for a children's service at Christmas.

Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill.:—

1. *AUGUSTANA SYNODENS REFERAT 1917*. 288 pages, plus statistics of parishes.
2. *THE GRACIOUS WATER OF LIFE*. Words of Counsel to the Parents of Newly Baptized Children. Dedicated to the children of God. By *Ira O. Nothstein*.

This is really a baptismal certificate. The certificate proper is in the center of this tastily bound volume in purple and white, and the reading-matter, interspersed with good reproductions mostly of Hofmann's pictures of the life of Christ, is grouped around it. At the end of the book a space is provided for the baby's picture and for the names of sponsors and guests. From a spiritual and artistic view-point we consider this the best Certificate of Baptism that we have seen.

3. *MY CHURCH*. An Illustrated Lutheran Manual Pertaining Principally to the History, Work, and Spirit of the Augustana Synod. Vol. III. Edited by *Ira O. Nothstein*. 128 pages. 25 cts. and 60 cts.

When this tastily bound and well-edited annual made its first appearance two years ago, we fully described its character, scope, and usefulness. The present, in its contents and make-up, is the faithful successor of its predecessors. The anniversary character of the year just past naturally has tinged the contents also of this publication.

4. *A CRADLE ROLL MANUAL FOR LUTHERAN SUNDAY-SCHOOLS*. By *Rev. C. A. Lund*. 62 pages, in art cover. 30 cts.

This is the logical sequel to *The Gracious Water of Life*. It gives direction to those who have to conduct the Cradle Roll in modern Lutheran Sunday-schools.

5. *IN THE SERVICE OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE*. Two Tales from Olden Times. By *Margarete Lenk*. Translated from the German by *A. W. Kjellstrand*. 136 pages. 30 cts.
6. *THE CROSS AND THE CRESCENT*. A Story of the Boy Crusaders. By the same author and the same translator. 126 pages. 30 cts.

In the original these two stories are well known to most of our readers. The translation has been well done.

7. *THE GOOD SHEPHERD*. With 32 illustrations. 15 cts.
8. *LITTLE PLAYMATES*. Sayings and Doings of Other Children. These are good picture-books with short stories for small children.

The Macmillan Co., New York:—

THE ESSENTIALS OF EXTEMPORE SPEAKING. By Joseph A. Mosher, Ph. D. 207 pages. \$1.00.

Extempore speaking, as discussed in this little volume brimful of practical advice, is not necessarily impromptu speaking. The element of preparation is not entirely excluded from this form of public address. In the fourteen chapters into which the book divides the author says all that we expect can be said on the extempore speech and the extempore speaker.

Geo. H. Doran Co., New York:—

1. **RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.** By H. B. Sharman. 319 pages. \$2.50.

This volume deserves the earnest attention of Bible-students. When first seen, it looks like a Gospel Harmony. There are the conventional parallel columns of the texts, etc. But it is not a harmony, because the author makes no attempt, he declares, to harmonize. "No theory of the relations of these records has had any place in the work." The author first offers the records of the Synoptists, which he divides into 16 chapters and 151 paragraphs. Glosses relating to the original text or the translation—the Authorized Version—and parallel references are given in footnotes. A liberal margin is provided. The record of John is printed separately as Book II of this volume. It is divided into 16 chapters and 223 paragraphs. References in the margin indicate connections of John's account with that of the Synoptists. The footnotes are of the same order as in Book I. Two tables at the end of the volume exhibit the relations between the record of the Synoptists and that of John, and enable the reader to locate any verse in the four Gospels in this work.

2. **THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY**, Vol. V, No. 3, September, 1917, contains the following articles: The Church and the World, by J. K. Mozley, Dean of Pembroke College, Cambridge, England; Dr. Doellinger and the Reunion of the Churches, by W. L. Bevan; The United Church of Canada, by Herbert Kelly, Professor in the Central Theological College, Tokyo, Japan; The United Lutheran Church in America, by H. E. Jacobs, D. D., of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; The Historical Approach to the Problem of Church Unity, by Raymond Calkins, D. D., Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.; Origin of the Misunderstanding between the Roman Church and the East, by Louis Bréhier, Professor in the University of Clermont-Férand, France; The Spiritual Challenge to Democracy, by Shailer Matthews, D. D., of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago; Christianity and the Science of Religion, by David S. Cairns, D. D., Professor in the United Free Church College, Aberdeen, Scotland; St. Paul on Preaching, by Robert Law, D. D., Professor in Knox College, Toronto, Canada; W. J. Birkbeck and Russian Orthodoxy, by Nicholas Glubokovsky, D. D., Professor at the Orthodox Ecclesiastical Academy, Petrograd.

Sherman, French & Co., Boston:—

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL for October, 1917, presents the following articles: The War-made Empires and the Martial Races of the Western World, by L. P. Jacks; Peace—and What Then? by the Countess of Warwick; The Peaceable Habits of Primitive Communities, by W. J. Perry; War as a Medicine, by G. F. Bridge; The Reconstruction of Theology, by Principal Selbei; The Incarnation and Modern Thought, by Father F. Cuthbert; The Indian Poetry of Devotion, by Nicol MacNicol, D. Litt.; Public Opinion in the United States in the Last Three Years, by President C. F. Thwing; Doctors, Lawyers, and Parsons, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hamilton Baynes; Are the Anglican Modernists Honest? by Professor Percy Gardner; The Scientific World and Dr. Mercier, by Sir Oliver Lodge; Telepathy as Interpreting Christ, by the Rev. J. H. Skrine, D. D.; Practical Religion, by H. G. Wells and Dr. Beattie Crozier; The New Religion, by Miss D. S. Batley; Survey of Recent Philosophical Literature, by Prof. S. Dawes Hicks; Book Reviews.

Books Received:—

THE WORD OF THE TRUTH. A Synopsis of the Vital Truth of the New Testament, Arranged in Continuous Order, Translated into Plain Words, in the Original Sense. By *Arthur Temple Cornwell*, Ed. Nov. The Truth Publishing Foundation, Eufaula, Ala. \$1.00.

KEY TO THE HEAVEN OF THE BEYAN, or a Third Call of Attention to the Behaists or Babists of America. By *August J. Stenstrand*. Also *The Fourth Call*, etc., and *The Fifth Call*, etc., by the same author. Chicago.

C. A. Windle, Editor *The Iconoclast*, answers Billy Sunday's "Booze" Sermon. Address delivered at Maryland Theater, Baltimore, Md., Sunday, March 19, 1916. The Personal Liberty League of Maryland.

THE LAST PHASE IN BELGIUM. Statement by *Viscount Bryce* on the Belgian Deportations Made in Reply to a Letter from the Representative of the *New York Tribune*. London, W. Speaight & Sons.

CHIVALROUS ENGLAND. By *André de Bavier*. From the *Revue des Jeunes*, April 10, 1916. London, Jas. Truscott & Son, Ltd.

TO NEUTRAL PEACE-LOVERS! A Plea for Patience. By *William Archer*. London, Sir Joseph Couston and Sons, Ltd.

NOTE.—Since the THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY will not be enlarged this year, in order to obtain space for other matter, the department of Book Review will for the time being be discontinued. Only serial publications, former issues of which have been noted in these pages, will be mentioned in future issues.

D.